THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1. APRIL, 1929. Vol. XIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Italy and the Pope.

Through the kindness of one of our regular contributors, we are enabled to publish the remarks of a distinguished French scholar and savant upon this subject. 'The reconciliation between Italy and the Papacy,' he writes, 'is a notable event. The results will not be clearly seen till later; and their character will depend on circumstances which it is impossible to predict. At first sight, materially at least, the Pope loses nothing: the Temporal Power is inexorably lost; and it is only as a foreign sovereign that he is recognized in Rome. On the religious side he appears to gain much: the recognition of Catholicism as the religion of the State; the nomination of the bishops; the necessity of religious marriage for Catholics; the establishment of religious teaching in Government colleges and schools.

'On the other hand, "the Prisoner of the Vatican" has a greater moral prestige than the *protégé* of Italy who succeeds him. For Mussolini, as for so many Italians, the Papacy becomes the auxiliary, if not the instrument, of the aspirations of the nation. That the Papal Imperialism should become the servant of Italian nationalism would be a grave, a very grave, event, and a menace to the peace of Europe.

'The power of Italy is, however, rather a nominal than a real force. The same may be said of that of the Papacy; and

the union of the two may in the long run be a misfortune rather to themselves than to mankind. For the Catholic nations have no wish to see the Roman Empire revived at their expense; or to let themselves subserve the political and economic interests of Italy. It is possible that by openly Italicizing itself the Papacy may be entering on the road to ruin; and that Italy, so far from embarking on a career of conquest, may be preparing bitter disappointments for itself. For the moment, indeed, we need not take these contingencies too seriously. The suggestion is that of a honeymoon couple; one asks, "How will the two agree?" and "Will the union be fertile?" Italians are given to superlatives; and the future may resemble rather a comedy than a tragedy. But onlookers will do well to watch its developments. For the actors are not on the stage for our amusement; their aim is rather that the performance shall be made at our expense.'

Patronage Reform.

An able article by Bishop Frodsham appears in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for February, criticizing the Benefices (Patronage) Measure which has recently been occupying the attention of the Church Assembly. The laudable object of this Measure is to satisfy the expectations of the parishioners 'without either injustice to the patron or injury to the clergy.' Bishop Frodsham maintains that the Measure, from the point of view of both people and patron, is inept and dilatory, while from the point of view of the clergy it is a piece of oppression—destructive of their civil and ecclesiastical rights. The article draws a careful comparison between the Benefices Act of 1898 and the present proposals. The differences between them are certainly startling, and very much to the disadvantage of the presented clergyman.

> 'He has no recognition. All he need know is that he has been nominated to a benefice. What, and of whom, enquiries are made; what is said about him; what the bishop's reasons for refusal are; what tale is carried to the archbishop if the patron appeals (*N.B.* The presented clerk cannot appeal); he has no right to any knowledge of these matters.'

With regard to diocesan boards of patronage, the author,

who speaks 'from long and intimate Australian experience of many varieties of such boards,' has come to the definite conclusion that 'they are the least satisfactory form of patronage that has ever been known.'

Least of all will Modernists find that these hole-and-corner bureaucratic methods work out to their advantage. The cause of Modernism, as of all minority movements in the Church, stands or falls with the independence of the individual clergyman. At present this freedom is being attacked from above and below. The bishop is arrogating to himself hitherto unheard-of powers; while the laity are claiming more and more control over their incumbent, who is more at their mercy than ever owing to the new financial stringency.

Dr. Henson, in his Diocesan Conference held on March 16, delivered a trenchant attack upon the Measure, which he pronounced to be of doubtful utility at the best, and to leave the worst defects of our existing system (patronage trusts) unremedied.

But the Bishop of Durham underlines heavily the point we have emphasised above:

> 'The Measure does not commend itself generally to the clergy whose interests personal and professional are directly affected. They see in it, and I must say frankly that I agree with them, a definite approach towards parochial election as the method of appointing incumbents. They discern, and again I agree with them, a disposition to treat the clergy with a certain lack of consideration which their character and their office fairly require. . . .
>
> 'Independence is the vital principle of the Christian ministry. Independence within the sphere of his duty is the English parson's most precious possession, and in his eyes it compensates for the many secular disadvantages of his lot. Imperil that, and you strip the ministry of the Church of England of its noblest and most distinctive characteristic. The appeal for ordination candidates withers on your lips. Independence, not money, is the magnet of the nobler spirits.'

Let us hope that the Church Assembly will curb its reforming zeal, and shelve this ill-considered and deleterious measure.

Voluntary Clergy.

The Bishop of Middleton and others have addressed to members of the Church Assembly and to the Press, a manifesto in favour of proposals which were formulated some years ago by the Rev. Roland Allen in a book entitled *Voluntary Clergy*.

'We ask consideration,' says the document, 'for the Ordination of men of approved character and mature years who shall render any ministerial service which they give free of all charge.' The signatories are careful to guard themselves against the charge of depreciating the value of the priestly character:

> 'We do not hold lightly the Office of a Priest. We do believe that there are many at present among the Laity, occupied in business which is, in the truest sense, their Vocation, who are as well fitted as men can be to administer the Holy Sacraments as ordained Ministers of God. Many of them are already licenced for the Ministry of the Word.'

It is suggested furthermore that in individual cases the initiative should come from the bishop:

> 'We know well the hesitation that would be felt by some of the most suitable men should it become possible for them to be ordained in this way. We would urge that men should not 'offer themselves' for the Ministry, *but that the Bishops should seek out fit persons and bring before them this special opportunity of service, and we believe that many of the best would answer the call.*'

It is noted that discipline would be easily exercised over these recruits to the ministry,

> 'as each Voluntary Clergyman would only be able to exercise his Ministerial Office under the Licence of the Bishop, who could withdraw it at any time without financial complications.'

An *addendum* to this document indicated that its proposals are designed to remedy the present shortage of clergy for the celebration of Holy Communion.

The comment we have to make upon these proposals is that, while strongly in favour of voluntary clergy, ordained without specific professional training, we doubt whether, under this scheme, men of the right type would be selected. It would serve no useful purpose merely to turn a number of lay readers into clergymen. What we need at present is not so much to increase the numbers, as to heighten the average quality, of our clergy. Good as lay-readers are, they are in no sense superior to the professional clergy; indeed, from the nature of the case they are bound, taking them as a whole, to be inferior in attainments and efficiency. What would follow from the dilution of the ministry might be an increase in numbers, but there would also be a decline in average quality.

And with regard to Holy Communion. In populous and understaffed parishes, this does constitute a grave difficulty. But the difficulty lies in the *administration*, and not in the *celebration* of the Sacrament. To celebrate Holy Communion is far less of a strain than to conduct Mattins or Evensong and preach a sermon. It is the *administering* of the Elements which takes the time, and wearies both congregation and celebrant.

The bishops could alleviate the difficulty by permission (or rather by a definite injunction) to administer in one kind, and always with the shortened form of words. Many of the laity dislike the use of the common Cup. And even if this truncated practice should, to some timid souls, seem dangerously Roman, what reasonable objection is there to the selection of suitable laymen (churchwardens and others) for the purpose of administering the Elements? It is only the ingrained sacerdotalism of the laity (for it is from the devout laity that the objection would come) that prevents this being done. Yet the priesthood of the laity is known to be a primitive belief; and what scandal is there in seeing a layman behind the altar rails?

Yet, as we have already observed, we are ourselves very strongly in favour of laymen being invited to take Orders while continuing their secular vocations. There are a number of laymen eminent in philosophy, literature and science who might well be ministers of a Church which needs them. Altogether apart from the regular performance by them of actual clerical duty, the presence of such men in the ministry might restore to the Church some of that influence and power of guidance which we seem to be losing. Let the reader suggest to himself the names of half a dozen eminent men who are to-day our real intellectual guides, and moral and spiritual leaders. Would not at least some of these be an asset to our ministry? And if the idea seems incongruous, does not this to some extent reflect upon that ministry—suggesting that its intellectual or spiritual vitality is defective?

This seems to us the kind of 'gesture'—if we are to call it so—that bishops might well make. They would need to take their courage in both hands: but they would not necessarily receive a snub. Their action would at least show that the ideal of an *entente* between culture and Christianity still survives.

Studdert Kennedy.

The death of the Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy leaves the Church of England poorer by the loss of one who honestly tried to face certain modern intellectual and ethical problems, to which many clergy and more laity, turn a blind eye—and to see his way through them. Moreover, his was not a merely academic mind; he was inspired by an ardent love for common humanity which made him *feel* the tragedy of innumerable lives sacrificed to selfishness and stupidity. Kennedy's influence on the great body of the clergy, who trusted and admired him, was thoroughly good. He led many of them to think more deeply and to sympathise more widely.

Studdert Kennedy's effectiveness and popularity among the troops were unparallelled. It is by this that he will be remembered. Yet it is very doubtful if another war would have found him in the position of an Army Chaplain.

Conferences at Jordans.

We have received from our Organizing Secretary the following letter, to which we are glad to give publicity :—

Sir,

I should be grateful if you would kindly allow me to draw the attention of your readers to the following short Conferences, which are to be held at Jordans (near Beaconsfield).

Open Conference.—May 10th (evening) to May 13th (morning). Cost, 30/-.

Conference for Clergy only.—Subject : 'Modernism in the Parish.' June 3rd (afternoon) to June 5th (afternoon). Cost, £1.

Details will be sent to those who apply, enclosing a stamped addressed envelope. As the accommodation is strictly limited early application for places is advised. Places can be reserved on payment of 2/6, which will be deducted from the cost.

Yours, etc.,

T. J. Wood.

Office No. 29, The Church House,
Westminster, S.W.1.

PARTIES AND PARTY SPIRIT: THEIR USE AND ABUSE*

By the Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D., Rector of Haughton, Staffordshire.

PROBABLY very few living people have read the Bampton Lectures of 1822, *The Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Matters of Religion*, by Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin (3rd ed., 1833). Almost everything that Whately wrote is still worth reading. Like Butler in the eighteenth century and Rashdall in our time, he was a moral philosopher, a close student of human nature, and a firm believer in reason. I will begin by giving a very brief summary of the eight lectures in order.

Introduction.

Party spirit is akin to *esprit de corps*, and φιλαδελφία, or 'love of the brethren': that is, not of evil origin nor evil in itself. But it generally means preferring the means to the end, the party to the object the party was formed for. It is fostered by love of leadership, novelty and disputation, and also by pride. It extinguishes charity, creates scandal, and establishes error.

I.

Text: *I Cor.* xii, 12, 13. As soon as the Church passed beyond Judaea it ceased to be one society. In a sense the Church is One because it has One Lord, One Spirit, One Baptism; but it is composed of distinct societies, only called One because they are founded on the same principles. It is futile to aim at uniformity. But brotherhood among Christians is essential, and must not be confused with charity towards all men, or philanthropy. 'Love the brotherhood.' 'Add to brotherly kindness charity.' This bond of union may be good or bad according to the use made of it. Thus, party feeling may inspire a statesman to render valuable service to the State, especially in time of war; or it may lead him to stir up dangerous factions. So, too, 'the same spirit which supported the infant Church against its pagan enemies became, when perverted and cor-

* A paper read to the Manchester Ministers' Fraternal Society on January 15th.

rupted, the fruitful source (especially in the more flourishing state of the Church) of furious contentions and obstinate schisms.' Nevertheless, in spite of the danger of controversy, deliberate abstinence from all controversy means sterility.

II.

Text: *Jas.* iii, 14-17. Falsehood is like poison. It is generally rejected if unadulterated, but if mixed with truth it is easily swallowed. In this lecture Whately elaborates the causes and products of party spirit mentioned in the Introduction. To these he adds love of victory. He adapts *I Cor.* xiii thus: 'Party spirit is *not* long-suffering nor kind; party spirit envieth, vaunteth itself, is puffed up,' and so on.

III.

Text: *I Cor.* iii, 3. Men in general are less zealous for what is desirable for its own sake than for what they have always been accustomed to. Mere conservatism is often an obstacle to truth, and hinders the reunion of separated Christians. All separation is *either a duty or a sin.* Party spirit leads some to prefer the Reformation to the reformed religion, the mitre to the Cross, the Church to the Gospel. The desire of leadership is a passion that must be carefully watched by the Christian. Openness to conviction is quite compatible with sincere belief in the truth, and zeal for its propagation. Truth can bear free discussion. (Here I interpolate a bit of Tertullian: 'It befits Truth to laugh because she is glad; to play with her rivals because she is free from fear.') There is an intellectual indolence which Thucydides expresses by the word ἀταλαίπωρος.[1] It means easy acquiescence in all that a Church or a party is supposed to stand for, without taking the trouble to prove all things and hold fast only that which is good. (This is the mediaeval *fides carbonarii*, the dying charcoal-burner's blind acceptance of he knows not what — the Church knows it for him.)

IV.

Text: *Rom.* xiv, 13. Avoid labelling people with party names, and then attributing all the doctrines of a sect to a man

[1] The reference is to *Thuc.* i, 20: οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας. 'The many are indifferent to the search for truth.'

who has only professed one of them. A man may actually be driven into heresy by imprudent opposition. For if you show him that certain beliefs, however absurd, are the logical consequences of his principles, he may be led to embrace those beliefs sooner than abandon his principles. Distinguish formal heresy from heretical intention. Arianism and Nestorianism were both strengthened by imprudent opposition. Insist on points of agreement rather than on points of difference. All truth is relative. The same words may convey truth to one man and falsehood to another. Beware of narrowness—the intellectual counterpart of lack of charity.

V.

Text: *II Tim.* ii, 24, 25. Oppose false teachers and false doctrines individually, each on their own merits. If you oppose them collectively you solidify opposition and foster party spirit. You thus provoke moderate men to defend extremists instead of openly disavowing them. One of the greatest obstacles to the renunciation of error is pride. Men are usually more ashamed to acknowledge an absurdity than to maintain it, especially if something good can be said for it, as indeed it generally can. No one is helped by knowing that confession of error will be met by humiliating exultation. We should admit the full force of an opponent's arguments. Our beliefs are often decided by a slight preponderance of evidence on one side or the other.

VI.

Text: *I Tim.* ii, 23. An educated man, as Aristotle says, seeks accuracy in each matter only so far as the nature of the subject allows it. Accuracy is often unattainable. We only 'know in part,' but familiar acquaintance is often mistaken for exact knowledge. Avoid inadequate causes for separation, *e.g.* the Filioque clause in the Nicene Creed. 'It is a remarkable fact that a man is usually less offended with those who profess to understand what he does not, than with those who acknowledge their inability to comprehend what he holds to be clearly intelligible; since these last will appear to entertain a suspicion at least (of what is probably the truth) that he has been deluding himself with empty fallacies and grasping a phantom.'

VII.

Text: *Col.* iv, 5. Zeal in members of a sect is often partly due to persecution and partly to a sense of inferiority (in modern language, an inferiority-complex). If the positions were exchanged, the zeal would often be found on the other side. This lecture is mainly concerned with the toleration and charity due from the Church of England to Dissenters.

VIII.

Text: *I Cor.* i, 12, 13. Of divisions within the Church. Extremes promote each other. Over-austerity encourages self-indulgence; 'mere morality' leads to faith without works; formalism provokes licence, and so forth. The moderate man is sometimes suspected of timidity or indifference or indolence. There is no glory in retaining one-half of one's congregation and driving the other half away. Let any minister who has done this consider whether he is able to say: 'I take you to record this day, I am pure from the blood of all men.' Avoid imputing bad motives. A zealous Christian may be really religious, *or* a busybody, *or* fond of display. Possibly he is all three. Our motives are usually mixed. Beware of shibboleths. When a word is in danger of acquiring a party meaning, use it in other senses. There was actually a Christ party at Corinth. Well may Paul exclaim: μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; ('Is Christ parcelled out?' Moffatt.)

I have one more quotation to make from Whately. In a private letter written in 1856 he observes that partisanship 'turns all the virtues into its own channel . . . Under its influence public spirit becomes party spirit. . . . The Romish Church is but a picture on a grand scale of what every party is in a minor degree.'[2]

But, as we have seen, party feeling or party spirit is not an entirely evil thing. It is based on the herd-instinct which all normal people possess. And a society is not always a party. Certainly the Ministers' Fraternal is not. Nor is the Modern Churchmen's Union. But 'when bad men conspire good men must combine'—for protection against persecution. And there

[2] *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 335.

is a better reason for combining. When we believe that we have a message worth giving to the world, we argue with opponents and issue books and pamphlets. If the Gospel is to be preached effectively it must be preached through a co-operative society, a mutually dependent ministry, as it was in the first century. These facts are familiar ground, but they make it all the more difficult to suppress party spirit. For every Church party professes to exhibit the virtues of the original body on a small scale. But the original body was formed, not to fight another Church, but to 'fight manfully under Christ's banner against the world, the flesh, and the devil.' Whereas parties are formed, not to help one another against the common foe, but to propagate some aspect of truth—or falsehood—in opposition to other Christians. Thus the interests of the mother Church are forgotten amid the strife of tongues, and men put loyalty to their party above loyalty to that which includes and transcends all parties.

Richard Baxter defines the Catholic Church as 'that whole which containeth all the parts, though some more pure and some less.' He cannot think it other than lamentable that most men 'think not that they are bound to love those, as the members of Christ, which are against their party'; but 'if they can but get to be of a sect which they think the *holiest* (as the Anabaptists and Separatists), or which is the *largest* (as the Greeks and Papists), they think that they are sufficiently warranted to deny others to be God's Church, or at least to deny them Christian love and communion.'[3]

Sects are more distinct than parties, as the derivation of the word implies, but Baxter's words apply to parties within a Church as much as to sects outside it. If it is the duty of the Church as a whole to be all things to all men, it would be impossible to suppress parties or any party in the Church of England without making it narrower. The true opposite of Broad Churchman is not Traditionalist, but Narrow Churchman. And there is such a thing as the narrowness of extreme breadth. A Broad Churchman who has his own shibboleths, and has no use for any other kind of Churchman, is himself guilty of narrowness. As Bishop Ryle said in a Cambridge University sermon

[3] *Autobiog.*, Lloyd Thomas, pp. 95, 99.

in 1899: 'No one party will represent the whole aspect of the truth; and the supremacy of any one party would herald the eclipse of all freedom of thought.' It is idle to dream of making the whole Church Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical or Modernist. The most that a party can hope to do is to exert a leavening influence on other parties, and make its own contribution to the welfare of the whole body. Nor is any member of a party bound to endorse all that its leaders say. *Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri* is no bad motto for those who would be good Christians first, good Churchmen second, and good party men third. Such men will not spend their time watching the weathercock on Durham Cathedral, or searching the sands for the prints of Bishop Canute's chair: they will seek truth of all kinds at all times and in all places; and an honest truth-seeker cannot be a party man. There is an impressive passage in the recent Autobiography of Houtin (p. 188) on the dominating power of truth, and loyalty to a *character* as distinct from loyalty to a *flag*.

Truth is the greatest unifier. Where there is no love of truth for its own sake there will be no sincere love of the brethren except of a very narrow and limited kind. And those who are convinced of any truth ought to be quite fearless in allowing full and free discussion of it.[4] Talking for victory in the Johnsonian manner is a bad habit. When we find that we are wrong no pride must prevent us from acknowledging defeat.

With most of what I have said thus far, even a good party man will probably agree. That is to say, he will accept my general principles. But when it comes to working them out in practice he will very likely repudiate them. For instance, when Dr. Percival, Bishop of Hereford, invited Nonconformists to partake of the Holy Communion with him in Hereford Cathedral in 1911, he thought he was only translating into action what two hundred bishops had by implication sanctioned at the previous Lambeth Conference. He was mistaken. In his Charge of 1912 he wrote these words: 'The whole incident should be remembered as an instructive object-lesson, showing us into what

[4] The example of the thousand priests who signed a protest against Dr. Major at the Church Congress last year is clearly not one to be followed. The Bishop of Gloucester offered to meet and confer with them, but they are said to have refused on the ground that the question did not admit of discussion.

inconsistencies and insincerities a neo-Tractarian Churchman may unconsciously drift, his kindly disposition and his desire for friendly relationships and co-operation and influence drawing him in one direction, whilst his ecclesiastical presuppositions and prejudices, his party ties and obligations draw him no less strongly in the other.'

It is quite common to hear a man denounce party spirit, when he is really envisaging a Church which is of no party because it is all of his party. Thus Bishop Gore in his Congress sermon of last year speaks of 'a horrible recrudescence of party spirit' in recent years. Yet in the same sermon, after alluding to the reunion proposals for Southern India, he says: 'Nothing is more essential to the Catholic idea of the Church than the maintenance in fact of the Apostolic Succession in the ministry, and the consequent conditions for the valid administration of the Sacraments.'

I must not turn aside to discuss the problem of intercommunion and reunion here, but it is obvious that party views have a great deal to do with it. I leave it an open question whether the formal reunion of the Churches is a goal to aim at. The idea of a great centralized Church is immensely attractive to some minds, but unity for unity's sake is not enough. We do not expect grown-up sons and daughters to live in the same house with their parents if they can help it. And in a clever family one may be an artist, another a preacher, and a third a drunkard. We react differently to our surroundings, according to our psychological make-up. One weeps, another prays, a third swears, in the same circumstances; and these three are not one. It is difficult to imagine a Roman Catholic and a Quaker in the same Church. Would not both be uncomfortable? That is one difficulty. Another is suggested by the Sadhu Sundhar Singh. He says: 'I do not believe that the union of Catholics and Protestants would accomplish a great deal. When you mix two colours you get a third: and if Catholics and Protestants unite you will have to be prepared to see a host of new sects and varieties arise.'[5]

Whether Catholicism or Protestantism is the religion of the future is partly a matter of the definition of terms: but for most

[5] Heiler, *The Gospel of Sundhar Singh*, p. 209.

people the question is answered by what they are themselves. Why not let both grow together until the harvest, and meanwhile abstain from civil war? The best remedy for extravagance is not persecution, but education. Reach a certain level of education and you are automatically lifted above the surrounding morass of popular superstitions. Yet no one suggests having one Church for the rich and another for the poor; or one Church for philosophers and another for fools, and a third for 'all sensible men.' This would mean impoverishment all round. At the same time it is reasonable enough to have a Fraternal Society for the learned, and a Pleasant Sunday Afternoon for those who prefer to fraternize without learning, as many Englishmen and more Englishwomen do.

We may fairly pick and choose in our religious life as we do in our social life and amusements, according to our tastes and abilities. And if a man joins a Church, or a society, for the propagation of certain beliefs, he need not be and ought not to be a partisan. If his conscience allows him to put truth in the second place, it must be stamped with the party trade mark before it is acceptable to him. Let me illustrate this. I know a lady who has decided that she has nothing to learn from an avowed Modernist. But when Modernist teaching reaches her duly peptonized by her own accredited teachers, she swallows it readily.

A good party man behaves like a loyal wife when her husband is in the dock. Or like Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, when Job is on the dung-hill. Those excellent party men—'orthodox liars for God,' as Coleridge calls them—were in no mood for dispassionate weighing of the evidence. They stood for the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* of their day. They were the God party, the spiritual ancestors of the Corinthian Christ party. And to-day some good party men insist on Fasting Communion and vestments, not because they are Scriptural or proved good, but because they bear the Catholic trade mark. Others repudiate these things because they are Popish, and insist on conversion because it is Evangelical, or on a six days' Creation because it is Scriptural. But in a comprehensive Church, which is not a mere 'well-managed episcopalian sect,' there must be high hills as a refuge for the ritualistic wild goats, as well as valleys where the wild asses of Fundamentalism may quench their thirst. And if we ever have to attack either, we can at least

try to avoid vague denunciations of the supposed views of imaginary opponents. This is a good way to stir up prejudice and win popular applause, but it is not honest.

Finally, let us draw encouragement as well as warning from the fact that there have been parties in the Church ever since St. Paul's time. The struggle of priest and prophet was followed by that of Hellenist and Judaizer, and the two types are with us still. We must find a *modus vivendi* on the lines of St. Paul's teaching. 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' Thus only shall we 'do nothing through faction or vainglory: thus only shall we 'look not only to our own things, but also to the things of others.'

We are told in the *Life and Letters of Dean Stanley* that 'he, like Archbishop Whately, refused to think that the Reformers locked the door and threw away the key for ever. It was to the union of a broad and simple Christianity with a free, enlightened historical science, that he looked for the birth of a great theology, "not dead, nor dying, but instinct with immortal life."' In this 'catholic, comprehensive, all-embracing Christianity' lay his hopes of Christian progress, of Christian union, of the final victory of faith over unbelief, and to it he believed that "the morrow, the coming century" belonged.' In 1864 he wrote to a friend: 'We are on the verge of a religious revolution—a revolution more gradual, I trust, and therefore more safe, but not less important, than the Reformation, and ending, I hope, not in further divisions, but in further union. If I could contribute to this result one-thousandth part, I should feel, humbly and thankfully, that I had done my work in life.'

Five years later Dr. William Bright, on his appointment as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, wrote to Stanley: 'I will never encourage—I will always discourage the temper of hard and unfair partisanship which would sacrifice truthfulness to the supposed interests of a cause. These are lessons which I learned from Arnold at Rugby, and from you at Oxford, which I shall hope and strive to remember as earnestly as any Broad Churchman could: and which, perhaps, have a special value and significance for a person occupying a different standpoint, because they manifestly transcend all diversities of ecclesiastical or theological opinion between those who worship Him Who is Truth and Love.'

THE NECESSITY OF ATHEISM

By the Rev. Canon H. J. Palmer, M.A., formerly Rector of Keighley.

'THE Necessity of Atheism.' Such was the title of a brief pamphlet published in 1811 by Shelley at the youthful age of nineteen years when an undergraduate at University College, Oxford; and which so horrified the authorities that he was summarily sent down from the University in consequence. He had been dubbed 'Atheist' at Eton, so it became him naturally to think out his position and defend his religious views. The harsh and unchristian attitude of the University had a marked effect upon his whole after-life and thought, and no one can doubt that the responsibility for errors which followed must rest upon those who acted so stupidly. If he had been sympathetically treated and his pamphlet viewed as a serious expression of youthful doubt—as a statement of the difficulties in the way of Christian belief by an intelligent thinker—how different might Shelley's life have been!

The question arises as to how far the Church and Society are responsible for youthful atheism to-day. As in Shelley's case, many Christians are still in rebellion against organized Christianity, and looking for a revolution to establish society on a Christian basis. The necessity of atheism will exist until we can get back to the teaching of Jesus Christ and the establishment of His Kingdom upon earth.

For Shelley was treated unintelligently not only by the Church, but by Society. His father, Timothy Shelley, a typical representative of the landed gentry of his day, seems to have been as stupid as the Oxford Dons were in the treatment of his son. If the former turned him out of the University, the latter turned him out of home. At least the father made absurd stipulations which the son would not accept, and as showing the character of his father's mind, he writes: Paley's Natural Theology I shall recommend my young man to read; it is extremely applicable. I shall read it with him: a father so employed must impress his mind more sensibly than a stranger.'

The French Revolution was stirring in full force at the time of his infancy, and at home the landed classes were quaking with

fear, lest it should upset the order of society in England. The organization of the Church must be used for all that it was worth, to check any revolutionary tendency.

An atheist was to be abhorred of all men. The necessity for atheism could not but mean the necessity for revolution in the social order, and it was not long before Shelley's imagination was fired with revolutionary desires for his country, and his songs were of the wrongs of the working classes. Timothy Shelley was an M.P. for the pocket borough of Shoreham, and he was anxious that his son should follow his steps and enter Parliament, as an orthodox country gentleman in the unreformed House of Commons, and the Duke of Norfolk, the 'Jockey' as he was termed, had much influence and was a friend of the family, and he was induced to point out to young Shelley that politics were the proper career for a young man of ability. And acting under this ducal advice he went several times with his father to the House of Commons, but it did not stir his imagination. 'What creatures did I see there!' he exclaimed. 'What faces — what an expression of countenance! What wretched beings!'

In a note on the 'Equality of Mankind,' he quotes: 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty them that are bruised,' and comments:

> 'That is an enunciation of all that Plato and Diogenes have speculated upon the Equality of Mankind. They saw that the great majority of the human species were reduced to the situation of squalid ignorance and moral imbecility, for the purpose of purveying for the luxury of a few, and contributing to their thirst for power. Too mean-spirited and too feeble to resolve to attempt the conquest of their own evil passions, and of the difficulties of the material world, men sought dominion over their fellow-men, as an easy method to gain that apparent majesty and power which the instinct of their nature requires.'

These feelings stirred him to write his song to the men of England, beginning:

> 'Men of England, wherefore plough
> For the lords who lay ye low?
> Wherefore weave with toil and care
> The rich robes your tyrants wear?'

Nothing showed the weakness of organized Christianity, and nothing proved the necessity of atheism more clearly than the

down-trodden condition of the majority of the poor in England at that time, after the French wars which added so much to the wealth of the rich and to the poverty of the poor. We look back with shame upon the condition of our country before the industrial revolution, and before the union of trades and the organization of labour had freed to some extent the slavery of the workers. It was enough, surely, to make any Christian atheistic if that was what Christianity had done for England!

The responsibility for Shelley's doubts rests upon those who defended the state of society in the name of the Church, and not upon those who called aloud for a revolution to introduce the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth; and his atheism is the natural outcome of the unchristian theology of the Church of his day. His defence of atheism, in truth, and seen from our standpoint, is more accurately a defence of real Christianity. His 'Necessity of Atheism' proclaims the necessity for right interpretation of Christianity.

The Church and the State, as they were in his day, confirmed him in unbelief and made him lose faith in both. Mr. Clutton Brock says of Shelley (*Man and the Poet*):

> 'He could take no patriotic pride in England as she was, nor could he conceive her as developing by any natural or constitutional process into the ideal state of his dreams. He was no revolutionary when he came to consider particular measures, since he was by nature averse from bloodshed and violence; but in those dreams to which he gave all his heart and all his genius, there is implied a revolution, not only in the nature of man, but in the whole order of the universe.'

And Mr. Stopford Brooke has written of what he did for theology in England:

> 'That theology was no better than all theology had become under the influence of the imperial and feudal ideas of Europe: its notion of God and of Man in relation to God, partly Hebraic and therefore sacerdotal and sacrificial, partly deeply dyed with asceticism and other elements derived from the oriental notion of the evil of matter, was further modified by the political views of the Roman Empire, transferred to God by the Roman Church.
>
> 'And when the universal ideas regarding mankind and a return to nature were put forth by France, they clashed instantly with the limited sacerdotal, ascetic, aristocratic and feudal theology: the sovereign right of God, because He was omnipotent, to destroy the greater part of his subjects, the right of a caste of priests to impose their doctrines upon all, and to exile all from religion who did not agree with them: the view that whatever God was represented to do was right, though it might directly contradict the nature, the conscience and the heart of man.'

Now it was antagonism to theological views of this kind that Shelley's 'Necessity of Atheism' is compelling. He held firmly to the belief

> 'That the will of God could not be in antagonism to the universal ideas concerning man: that His character could not be in contradiction to the moralities of the heart, and the destiny He wills for mankind must be as universal and as just and as loving as Himself.'

It has been pointed out that Shelley resembled Blake in the contrast of feeling with which he regarded the Christian Religion and its Founder. For the human character of Christ he could feel the deepest veneration; but he held that the spirit of Established Christianity was wholly out of harmony with that of Christ, and that a similarity to Christ was one of the qualities most detested by the modern Christian.

At a very early age, then, we find Shelley writing as an atheist, (1) because of the vicious inequalities and hopeless condition of the working classes in a kingdom nominally acknowledging God and with the Christian Religion established and endowed in every parish, and (2) because of the false dogmas of the Churches, setting forth the Nature and Operations of the Deity.

A closer examination of his pamphlet, 'The Necessity of Atheism,' bearing in mind his condition and surroundings, for which he was excluded from Oxford, shut out from his home, eventually dying in exile from his country, makes clear to us that he was up against a false theology, and that his arguments, long since answered, may be taken as an early inspired movement towards a saner and purer revelation of a God of Love, voiced by a dissatisfied and revolutionary spirit, struggling for expression in a body of humiliation in an age of despair.

He begins with a statement and comment, 'There is no God.'

> 'This negation must be understood solely to effect a creative deity. The hypothesis of a pervading Spirit, co-eternal with the Universe, remains unshaken.'

Then he stresses the insoluble difficulty felt by all thoughtful religious people:

> 'It is easier to suppose that the Universe has existed from all eternity than to conceive a being beyond its limits capable of creating it: if the mind sinks beneath the weight of one, is it an alleviation to increase the intolerability of the burden?'

Then positively:

> 'There certainly is a generative power which is effected by certain instruments: we cannot prove that it is inherent in these instruments; nor is the contrary hypothesis capable of demonstration.
>
> 'We admit that the generative power is incomprehensible; but to suppose that the same effect is produced by an eternal omniscient being leaves the cause in the same obscurity, but renders it more incomprehensible.'

Further:

> 'We see a variety of bodies possessing a variety of powers: we merely know their effects: we are in a state of ignorance with respect to their essences and causes. These Newton calls the phenomena of things; but the pride of philosophy is unwilling to admit its ignorance of their causes. From the phenomena which are the objects of our senses, we attempt to infer a cause, which we call God, and gratuitously endow it with all negative and contradictory qualities. From this hypothesis we invent the general Name, to conceal our ignorance of causes and ignorances. The being called God by no means answers with the conditions prescribed by Newton: it bears every mark of a veil woven by philosophical conceit, to hide the ignorance of philosophers even from themselves. They borrow the threads of the texture from the anthropomorphism of the vulgar.'
>
> 'The consistent Newtonian is necessarily an atheist. Sir W. Drummond seems to consider the atheism to which it leads as a sufficient presumption to the falsehood of gravitation; but surely it is more consistent with the good faith of philosophy to admit a deduction from facts than an hypothesis incapable of proof, although it might militate with the obstinate preconceptions of the mob. Had the author, instead of inveighing against the guilt and absurdity of atheism, demonstrated its falsehood, his conduct would have been more suited to the modesty of the sceptic and the toleration of the philosopher.'

As would be assumed, he was particularly distressed by the doctrine of eternal punishment:

> 'Jesus Christ,' he says, 'would hardly have liked as an example of all that is gentle and beneficent and compassionate, a Being who shall deliberately scheme to inflict on a large portion of the human race tortures indescribably intense and indefinitely protracted; who shall inflict them, too, without any mistake as to the true nature of pain—without any view of future good—merely because it is just.'

In reading these extracts, we cannot help wondering how far modern Scholarship and Higher Criticism would have modified Shelley's views as to the necessity of atheism, and we are grateful that a clearer day of theology has dawned upon the modern world, which is gradually and surely clearing away the darkness and gloom of the last centuries' ugly and defenceless beliefs. More than half a century after, the great Christian theologian, F. D. Maurice, was condemned for destroying belief in

eternal punishment, which had much to do with Shelley's atheism.

To estimate more clearly Shelley's beliefs and disbeliefs, and to recognize the debt we Christians owe him for expressing and suffering for them, we must look at some of his other earlier writings as the setting for his necessity of atheism.

In his essay on Christianity he writes:

'The Being who has influenced in the most memorable manner the opinions and the fortunes of the human species is Jesus Christ. At this day, His name is connected with the devotional feelings of two hundred millions of the race of men. The institutions of the most civilized portions of the globe derive their authority from the sanction of his doctrines. He is the hero, the God, of our popular religion.'

And in a beautiful passage on the pure in heart seeing God he says:

'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are those who have preserved internal sanctity of soul; who are conscious of no secret deceit; who are the same in act as they are in desire; who conceal no thought, no tenderness of thought, from their own conscience; who are faithful and sincere witnesses, before the tribunal of their own judgment, of all that passes within their mind. Such as these shall see God. What! after death shall their awakened eyes behold the King of Heaven? shall they stand in awe before the golden throne on which He sits, and gaze upon the countenance of the paternal Monarch? Is this the reward of the virtuous and the pure? These are the idle dreams of the visionary, or the pernicious representations of imposters, who have fabricated from the very material of wisdom a cloak for their own dwarfish and imbecile conceptions.'

And further:

'Whoever is free from the contamination of luxury and licence may go forth to the fields and to the woods, inhaling joyous renovation from the breath of Spring, or catching from the odours and sounds of Autumn some divine mood of sweetest sadness which improves the softened heart. Whosoever is no deceiver or destroyer of his fellow-men—no liar, no flatterer, no murderer—may walk among his species deriving from the communion with all which they contain of beautiful or of majestic, some intercourse with the Universal God. Whosoever has maintained with his own heart the strictest correspondence of confidence, who dares to examine and to estimate every imagination which suggests itself to the mind—whosoever is that which he designs to become, and only aspires to that which the Divinity of his own nature shall consider and approve—he has already seen God.'

'We live and move and think: but we are not the creators of our own origin and existence. We are not the arbiters of every motion of our own imaginations and moods of mental being. There is a Power by which we are surrounded, like the atmosphere in which some motionless lyre is suspended, which visits with its breath our silent chords at will.'

Having suffered bitterly for the treatment he received for

the expression of his views on the necessity of atheism, he was always very keen afterwards to defend boldly and vigorously any who were condemned for holding like beliefs. As for instance in an open letter to Lord Ellesborough, who had sentenced to imprisonment a certain Daniel Eaton in 1812 for publishing part of Paine's *Age of Reason*:

> 'What right had you to punish Mr. Eaton? What but antiquated precedents, gathered from times of priestly and tyrannical domination, can be adduced in palliation of an outrage so insulting to humanity and justice? Whom has he injured? What crime has he committed? In the name of Justice what answer is there to these questions? The answer which heathen Athens made to Socrates is the same which Christian England must attempt to silence the advocates of this injured man—"He has questioned established opinions." Alas! the crime of inquiry is one which religion never has forgiven. Implicit faith and fearless inquiry have in all ages been irreconcilable enemies. Unrestrained philosophy has in every age opposed itself to the reveries of credulity and fanaticism.'

Concluding on this vehement outburst of righteous indignation, we cannot but admit that Shelley has justified his necessity of atheism, and we may be grateful that he expressed it and that it now belongs to an age of the past which he conspicuously helped to clear of a false theology.

Shelley, says Mr. Clutton Brock, at his best

> 'sings like an angel for an audience of angels; for however lonely, he is never an egotist, and does not talk to himself about himself. He would hold communion with men if he could, and always desired to love them and to be loved by them. And from his lack of this communion he became the most intimate friend of Nature that ever was: often in his poetry he seems to sing to an audience of mountains, winds and clouds, as if they would understand him better than the human beings who received his music with rage or laughter.'

Let us take leave of his atheism with one of his inspired and prophetic songs stealing over our souls:

> 'Make me thy lyre, even as the forest is:
> What if my leaves are falling like its own!
> The tumult of thy mighty harmonies
> Will take from both a deep autumnal tone,
> Sweet though in sadness. Be thou, spirit fierce,
> My spirit! Be thou me, impetuous one!
> Drive my dead thoughts over the Universe
> Like weathered leaves to quicken a new birth!
> And, by the incantation of this verse,
> Scatter as from an unextinguished hearth
> Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!
> Be through my lips to unawakened Earth
> The trumpet of a prophecy! O Wind,
> If winter comes, can spring be far behind?'

MYSTICAL PRAYER

By Friedrich Heiler, Theol.Dr. (University of Marburg)

Translated by the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D.

(N.B.—We are indebted to Dr. McComb for his kind permission to print this extract from his translation of Dr. Heiler's *Das Gebet*, which will appear in the Autumn.)

A.—Concentration.

THE praying mystic turns away from external reality, suppresses by force of will all ideas and emotions which have this reality in view and focuses his whole attention on the highest spiritual Reality, that is, on God. As Tauler says: 'Turn thyself in truth from thyself and from all created things and centre thy mind wholly upon God.' The concentration on the Highest Good clothes itself for the most part in the form of petition, less frequently in the form of earnest complaint and question; yet the petition or the question is continuously interrupted by contemplation. The safety of the soul in God is the subject of petition. The mystic begs from God that condition of soul for which he strives, namely, the isolation of the soul from the objective world, the suppression of the emotions and instinctive movements of the will, inner peace and unity, enthusiastic surrender to the Highest Good, ecstasy. The entire gradation in the stages of the mystical process of salvation from the 'purgative' to the 'illuminative' and from the 'illuminative' to the 'unitive' way is reflected in the content of the mystical petition.

The 'purgative way' means detachment from the world. 'Grant to me,' says Thomas A'Kempis, 'that I may die to all things that are in the world, that for Thy sake I may be willing to be despised and ignored in this age.' It means also detachment from the feelings and desires of the self. 'If in me,' writes Augustine, 'there dwells a desire for anything superfluous, do Thou purify me, and make me capable of beholding Thee.' J. H. Newman prays: 'Purify my heart of all that is earthly, all that is proud and sensual, all that is hard and cruel, of all perversity, of all disorder, of all deadness.' Finally, it implies the spirit and sorrow of repentance.

The 'illuminative way' implies (*a*) rest and peace in God. A'Kempis writes: 'Grant to me above all things that I can desire, to desire to rest in Thee and in Thee to have my heart at peace.'[1] 'Thou art the true peace of the heart; Thou art its only rest.'[2] (*b*) Identification of one's own will with God's will. 'Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt!' cries Augustine. (*c*) Exclusive turning to the Highest Good. 'For Thee,' cries Bonaventura, 'may my soul long, for Thee may it always hunger and thirst, to Thee may it ever strive, Thee may it seek and find, to Thee may it hasten and Thee attain, may it think of Thee, speak of Thee and do everything to the honour and glory of Thy name.' (*d*) Faith, hope and love. 'Grant that I may believe in Thee more, set my hope on Thee, love Thee'—so prays Thomas Aquinas. (*e*) Fervent love to God. 'O love that ever burnest and is never consumed!' exclaims Augustine. 'O love, my God, kindle me!' Similarly Newman: 'Come into my heart and fill it with fervent zeal by filling it with Thyself.'

The 'unitive way' is experienced (*a*) in the consciousness of the presence of God. 'Come, O come; for without Thee I shall have no joyful hour or day; for Thou art my joy and without Thee my table is empty'—so A'Kempis invokes the Divine presence. 'Show me Thy countenance,' says Gertrude of Helfta, 'and let me see Thy form.' (*b*) Ecstatic union with God. A'Kempis writes: 'O when shall it be fully granted me to see how sweet Thou art, my Lord God? When shall I fully gather up myself in Thee that by reason of my love to Thee I may not feel myself but Thee alone, above all sense and measure.'[3] (*c*) Eternal vision of God and union with Him in the world beyond. 'When shall I fully rejoice in Thee? When shall I have solid peace, peace secure and undisturbed, peace within and peace without. O merciful Jesus, when shall I stand to behold Thee?'[4]

B.—Contemplation.

Mystical prayer shows an inner advance from longing for God to possession of Him. At first the mystic asked to be puri-

[1] *Solil*, i, 6 seq.
[2] *Im.* III, xv, 4.
[3] *Imit.* iii, 21.
[4] *Ibid.* III, xlviii, 3.

fied from all feelings and wishes and to be ruled entirely by his experience of the supreme Good; but now he is taken possession of by this one infinite Good. He no longer asks, he no longer gathers himself together, he only contemplates the infinite Goodness, greatness and beauty of God. Dread, reverence, wonder, astonishment, rapture seize him; an infinite bliss pours through him. In matchless words Plotinus has described this wonderful experience of mystical contemplation. 'He who beholds it (the Highest Good)—what a glow of love will flame through him, what an ardent yearning will melt him into oneness with it, what an awful bliss will make him to tremble! He who has not yet beheld it longs for it as for the absolutely Good, is filled with a blessed admiration, is shaken without being injured. He loves with a true love and laughs at any other love, he despises everything that he had formerly held to be beautiful. Those experience something similar to whom has been vouchsafed the vision of a god or of a spirit and who now are not susceptible to the beauty of other bodies. How much more then will he who has gazed upon the absolute beauty in its native purity, be free from the desire of fleshly or bodily beauty, whether it is earthly or heavenly.'[5]

The contemplative absorption is for the most part dumb; the exceptional vision of the *summum bonum* is speechless. But sometimes the motion accompanying the experience of the good is so forceful that it is discharged outwardly in language. The contemplative mystic ejaculates brief cries following one another with a rhythmical swing.

(1) Purely Aesthetic Contemplation.

The mystic contemplates God as the only, highest and infinite Value, as the source of all intellectual, ethical and aesthetic values, as the cause of bliss and blessedness, as the only and highest goal of all human striving. 'Thou art the highest good,' writes Augustine. 'Highest, best, most mighty, most pitiful and most just, most beautiful and most strong!'[6] 'O highest Lord,' ejaculates Teresa, 'O Thou my King, O exalted might, infinite

[5] *Enn. i*, 6, 7.

[6] *Conf.* iv, 1.

goodness, eternal wisdom, without beginning and without end, fathomless depths of wonder, source of all power and beauty!'[7] Sometimes the contemplation of the divine infinitude and fulness of being becomes in brilliant paradoxes a contemplation of God as the union of opposites. Augustine exclaims: 'Most merciful yet most just, most hidden yet most present, most beautiful yet most strong, stable yet incomprehensible, unchangeable yet all changing, never new, never old, ever working yet ever at rest.'[8] So too, Symeon 'the new theologian': 'Thou art wholly immovable, yet art Thou ever moving; Thou art wholly outside all creatures yet art Thou in all creatures; Thou fillest the universe yet art Thou wholly outside the universe.'[9]

The contemplation of the opposites enclosed in the being of God may at times rise to the pantheistic thought of the 'One and All.' A prayer of the Maitrâyana-Upanishad begins with the words: 'Thou art Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra, Prajâpati, Agni, Varuna, Vâyu, Thou art Indra, Thou art the light of the night, Thou art the spirit of food, Thou art death, the earth, the All: in manifold ways, whatever is rests in Thee.'

This purely aesthetic selfless contemplation of the *summum bonum*, One and the All, this adoring absorption in the being and plenitude of God forms the chief part of mystical prayer. Though it again and again slips into petition and self-surrender, yet at its highest it frees itself from all other forms of prayer.

(2) Praise and Thanksgiving.

The contemplation of the greatness, goodness, holiness and beauty of God passes over frequently into a rapturous rejoicing and giving of praise and thanks. 'Let my soul praise Thee that it may love Thee; and let it confess to Thee Thy mercies that it may praise Thee. The entire creation ceases not and is not silent in Thy praises. Neither the spirit of man, through the voice directed toward Thee, nor creation animate or inanimate, by the voice of those who contemplate it, that so our souls may rise out of their weariness to Thee, leaning on the things which

[7] *Gold. Büch.*, p. 155.
[8] *Conf.* i, 4.
[9] *Div. Am.*, 15.

Thou hast made, and making them stepping-stones to Thee."[10] Or take this from St. Teresa: 'O Lord of the universe, all creatures would praise Thee! Who can proclaim loudly enough how faithful Thou art to Thy friends? Would that I had understanding and knowledge and words wholly new that I might glorify the wonders of Thy love as my soul feels it.'[11]

(3) Surrender and Resignation.

The praying mystic knows no other good than the Infinite, and in splendid heroism he renounces all self-will and gives himself wholly to God. The perfect surrender of love follows on the contemplation. Love to God gives rise to a perfect denial of all self-will, an unreserved surrender to the Highest Good, a heroic submission to the sovereign will of God. 'Take away my entire liberty,' prays Ignatius Loyola. 'Take away memory, understanding, and all my will. What I have Thou hast given me: I give it all back to Thee for Thy governance. Only give to me Thy love with Thy grace and I am rich enough and ask for nothing more.'[12] This surrender of the human will to the divine, the mystic describes as 'an offering.' The mystical prayer of resignation agrees in various ways in expression with the prayer of Epictetus. In spite of the accidental similarity we are not to think of any literary connection between the Christian mystic and the Stoic philosopher. Identical words of prayer are the expression of fundamentally different psychic moods. The Stoic prayer of resignation is the expression of a courageous moral will which is determined to bear every fate while the mystical prayer of resignation issues from the enthusiastic surrender of love to the Highest Good whereby every personal wish and will is struck dumb.

(4) Contemplation of One's Own Unworthiness and of the Divine Miracle of Grace.

The contemplation of one's own unworthiness is often bound up with the contemplation of God as the only Good.

[10] *Augustine: Conf.* v, i.

[11] *Leben.*, chap. xxv.

[12] *Exerc. Spirit.*, hebd. 4.

Says an unknown Dominican mystic: 'Man sinks into his own littleness and nothingness; the clearer and the more distinctly the greatness of God shines upon him, the more he realises his littleness.' Symeon 'the new theologian' confesses: 'All the organs of my body and soul I have stained with sin from my birth onwards; I am wholly sin.' Similar confessions of sin and words of regardless self-despising may be read in countless writings of the mystics. Yet there is here a strangely paradoxical experience. The inner eye of him who prays is directed towards a double object, God's infinitude, holiness, beauty and love; and the meanness, sinfulness, hatefulness and corruption of the self. All these contrary emotions and feelings of value pass into a harmony which is yet a contrast, an overwhelming experience which breaks out into prayer. A'Kempis speaks to God: 'O Lord, my God, Thou art to me whatsoever is good. And who am I that I should dare to speak to Thee? I am Thy poorest, meanest servant, and a most vile worm, much more poor and contemptible than I can or dare express. Yet do Thou remember, O Lord, that I am nothing, have nothing, and can do nothing. Thou alone art good, just and holy; Thou canst do all things, Thou accomplishest all things and fillest all things.'[13]

The paradoxical character of the mystical experience is increased by the thought that the infinite God stoops to insignificant sinful man, communicates Himself to him, and unites Himself to him. The mystic glories in this incomprehensible miracle of grace; he scarcely dares to look up, he trembles, he thrills with ecstatic bliss. 'How can I, stained in body and in soul, appear before Thee?' asks Symeon 'the new theologian.' 'How can I, a wretch, stand before Thy face? How must I not flee from Thy glory and the flashing light of Thy Holy Spirit?'[14]

C.—Ecstasy.

The highest and holiest prayer of the mystic is the ecstatic prayer which is no longer prayer in the ordinary sense. In the ravishing vision of God, there is a decisive distinction between the soul and God, between the finite creature and the infinite

[13] *Imit.* iii, 5. [14] *Div. Am.*, 17.

Spirit; but in the ecstatic union with God, all distinctions are abolished, the praying soul and the Being prayed to, the 'I' and the 'Thou' are mingled together in indissoluble unity. Every word of prayer, nay, every prayerful attitude of mind has ceased; there are no longer two, but one; the finite is swallowed up by the infinite. This ecstatic 'union of substance' is inexpressible because it is accomplished in a realm beyond waking consciousness. But when the mystic awakes from the ecstatic, God-intoxicated state, he tries to express the inexpressible in stammering words. He can only make known his happiness in the formula: 'I am Thou and Thou art I.' This prayer is found on the lips of Indian, Persian, Greek and Christian mystics.

'I sink myself in Thee,
I in Thee, Thou in me.'

so sings Tersteegen.

More frequently the Christian mystic substitutes this 'formula of *immanence*' for the formula of *identity*. Only when the mystic can utter such a prayer has he found God completely and abides at one with Him eternally. Jalâl-ed-dîn-Rûmî, the classic of Islamic mysticism, has veiled this thought in a striking parable. 'A lover came once by night before the door of his beloved and knocked. Then she cried: "Who knocks there?" And he answered: "It is I." She did not open the door, but said harshly: "Away with you!" Then the young man went abroad and wandered through the world until love with its irresistible strength drove him back to the abode of his beloved. And he knocked again, gently and softly, in shy hope. And again the question of his beloved rang out: "Who knocks there?" And he answered: "It is thou who standest once again before the door." Then the one addressed opened to him with the words: "O beloved, come in; my little chamber is not large enough for two, but since thou art nothing more than I, there is room in the chamber and at the table."'

The fundamental thought of mysticism is clearly expressed in this story, the identity of the human and the divine. Throughout the mystical literature of the East and the West there sounds like an ever-recurring theme this formula of ecstatic identity. The mystics form an invisible brotherhood scattered through all lands and times; though separated by space and

time they reach hands to each other and agree in saying that God and man are separated only in outer appearance, both are indissolubly one. In spiritual transport they utter the great mystical prayer: 'I am Thou and Thou art I.'

D.—The Refusal to Pray for Earthly Goods.

Primitive prayer for external things is irreconcilable with the fundamental strain of mysticism. When it does occur among mystics, chiefly as petition for others, it plays a thoroughly secondary rôle, and runs as something independent alongside the mystical prayer centred on God and salvation. The genuine mystic, just as much as the philosophical critic, rejects prayer for earthly things as irreligious. The subject of prayer is exclusively, 'God and the Soul,' God the Highest Good, and the salvation and blessedness of the soul in the Highest Good. As Augustine says: 'Ask nothing from God except God Himself. Ask for the blessed life'—and for him the blessed life is the eternal life, the contemplation of the divine blessedness forever. Prayer for material goods is for him 'carnal prayer'; to the spiritually twice-born only 'spiritual prayer' is seemly. Prayer for the fulfilment of self-seeking wishes contradicts the mystical ideal of absolute identity with the will of God. 'To pray: Ah Lord, turn from me this fate, is verily sin against Him who gave it.'[15]

Finally, the nothingness and worthlessness of everything earthly makes prayer for passing things mere folly. Eckhart sets forth the repudiation of all self-seeking, materialistic prayer in a charming parable: 'A sick man was asked why it was he did not pray to God to make him well. The man said that he would not like to do so for three reasons. One was that he wanted to be sure that the loving God never willed suffering, that perhaps he was sick for his best good. Another was that if a man is good he will desire what God wills, and not that God should will what he desires. And therefore He wills that I should be sick, for if He did not will it I would not be sick. And so I ought not to wish to be well. . . . . The third reason why it would be unpleasing to me to ask God to make me well

[15] *Jalâl-ed-dîn-Rûmî.*

is this: I will not, and I ought not to pray the rich and loving God for such trifles. Supposing that I should come one or two hundred miles to the good Pope and should say to him, "O Lord, Holy Father, I have come a hard road two hundred miles at great expense, and this is why I have come: I beg you to give me a bean." Truly he himself and whoever else heard it, would say that I was a great fool. Now this is the one certain truth which I say, that every good compared with God is less than a bean. Therefore, if I am a wise and good man, I should refuse with scorn to ask God to make me well."[16]

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, B.Sc.

THE CLERGY.

WE have seen that certain tendencies, administrative and economic, have begun to undermine the position of the beneficed clergyman in the Church of England. Partly, though by no means entirely, as a result of this undermining process, it has become increasingly difficult to recruit the ranks of the clergy. Effectives are said to have dropped from 21,000 before the war to 16,500; while the average recruitment is estimated at about 350, as against the retirement or death of 550. This is all the more remarkable when one considers how overcrowded are the other professions. In a generation, if the decline continues only at its present rate, the number of clergy will be half what it was before the war. And what is even more serious is that there is a general agreement amongst bishops and their examining chaplains that candidates for ordination have declined not only in quantity but in quality. Without going so far as a recent writer, who has described them as 'the dregs of the universities,' we may take it that the type is not what it used to be.

This decline in the quality of ordinands has not been placed so prominently before the public as the decline in their quantity,

[16] Pfeiffer: *Deutsche Mystiker des 14 Jahrhunderts*, p. 544.

perhaps because this is a loss which the public can hardly be expected to cure. But a great deal has been made of the fall in numbers, and the authorities of the Church have decided to attribute it, primarily, to financial causes. Young men cannot find the money for a long and expensive training.

But, though so widely advertised, financial obstacles are by no means the most important factor in producing the decline in quantity and quality of ordination candidates. In some small measure it may be due to the new vexations and humiliations which the parochial clergy must endure as the result of recent reforms, and which have already been alluded to; but there are other causes which are even more effective.

One of these has undoubtedly been the fundamental change which, during the past thirty years, has taken place in English education. There can be little doubt that the supply of clergy has been seriously affected by the elimination of the old country Grammar Schools, founded for the most part under the Tudors, which gave to the sons of country clergy, farmers and local tradesmen an education primarily classical and literary. These schools, with antiquated buildings, primitive equipment, and often rather inferior teaching, were civilizing agencies in the localities to which they belonged. Most of such schools had scholarships, left by ancient benefactors, to colleges in Oxford or Cambridge, which formed a link between the school and the university. Boys who showed ability were encouraged to go up to the university even if, as was generally the case, their parents were poorly off. Often the sixth form, which might number anything from half a dozen to a dozen, included several boys whose ambition it was to become clergymen. Though not 'pious,' their tastes were scholarly, and they were devoted, perhaps without knowing very clearly why, to the ancient parish church which generally stood close to the old school. The classics, the Greek Testament, the Church of England liturgy, were all somehow bound up together in their minds, and seemed to stand for all that was civilised and decent in life.

These schools have now been swept away, and the ideals of culture which they represented have passed away from the section of English society which they formerly enlightened. Some

of these schools, as they saw the evil days approaching, transformed themselves into public schools of the recognised type. But as such they ceased to exist as centres of local culture, for a public school is not interested in, nor does it cater for, the locality. Day boys are discouraged and despised. The schools which failed to achieve this metamorphosis were forcibly transformed by the Board of Education, and became Secondary Schools, their characteristic being efficiency, and their object the passing of examinations. The ideals of these transformed schools, excellent as they may be, are quite different from those of the old Grammar Schools which, like the Church of England, were products of the Renaissance which was a literary, and not a scientific movement. The boys educated in these schools on a curriculum which relegates the classics to the background, and lays all the emphasis on mathematics and science, subjects devoid of cultural value (at least as taught in secondary schools) have no more desire to be clergymen than to be Tibetan lamas. Their ambitions lie in an entirely different direction: they desire to be aviators, or motor engineers. Their ideals are those of the new scientific barbarism with which we are surrounded.

This transformation of English middle-class education has undoubtedly affected the supply of ordination candidates. With regard to the Public Schools, the number of men educated at them who become clergymen has been steadily declining for years. Statistics compiled in the case of one of our greatest public schools, give the result that within a space of forty-five years the ideal of the Christian ministry has lost four-fifths of its popularity. Yet in these schools much of the education remains primarily classical and literary; and the financial difficulty certainly does not operate here. But it is probable that in these schools also a certain change of atmosphere has taken place. The idealistic and religious revival initiated by Thomas Arnold may be presumed by now to have spent its force; and nothing equivalent save the cult of athletics, has taken its place. The young writers who emerge from these great English schools affect an air of cynical pessimism or frank paganism. And even those who are untainted by the *fin de siécle* pose of the intelligentsia, prefer the emoluments of commerce to those of the

Church, and this not solely because they are larger. The situation might be summed up by saying that whilst in Arnold's day the ablest boys became idealistic and religious, nowadays they become cynics and indifferentists. It may be urged that this is merely a pose, but the same might be urged of the Arnoldian idealism. Youth is the victim of poses; and a pose is a sign of the times.

The position seems to be more or less as follows. The section of society which receives its education at the public schools, owing to an increasing paganism of outlook, is decreasingly desirous of recruiting the ranks of the clergy. This would not greatly interfere with the supply of candidates for holy orders were it not for the fact that middle class education, *i.e.* that supplied by the Secondary Schools, is increasingly materialistic both in content and outlook. There remains a section of society which has hitherto contributed only sparsely to the supply of clergy, *i.e.* the section which receives its education at our elementary schools. It is this that it seems to be the policy of the bishops at present to tap.

This is the section of society which, of the difficulties which block the road to ordination, finds the financial the most serious. This class has no money for prolonged schooling, still less for the university and theological college which must follow it. Hence the campaign for money to pay for the training of ordination candidates.

It is important to realise where this new policy of subsidised ordination candidates is leading us. It has two notable results. In the first place, the natural result is to make the training as inexpensive as possible, since it has to be paid for out of Church funds, which are difficult to raise. Hence, except in the cases of men of exceptional ability, the tendency is to remain satisfied with the training given by a non-graduate theological college, which does not involve a university degree, or only does so in what must be termed an inferior manner. The first point, then, is that on the subsidy system the men get an inferior education, which will compensate in no degree for the cultural poverty in which they will have been reared.

But this is not the most important, nor the most deleterious, result of the new system. Upon the surface the system seems sufficiently philanthropic; but in ecclesiastical affairs things are very rarely what they seem. For the plain fact is that the man who receives money is no longer free. Of course the amount of freedom sacrificed is proportionate to the amount of financial help accepted; but the subsidised ordinand in the non-graduate college, who may be wholly dependent for the cost of his training upon grants from the ecclesiastical authorities, is the man who merits our sympathy, and prompts our misgivings. He is entirely at the mercy of the college authorities, who can cast him off any day. There is no possible redress, since the candidate is an object of charity, and has no right to what he receives. Nor do the authorities of these institutions invariably resist the temptations which beset those who enjoy autocratic powers. Discipline no doubt has to be established and preserved, but it is not offences caused by the ebullience of youth to which the authorities will take most serious exception. In a seminary, many offences may be overlooked, but heresy is not one of them. The point is that the financial pull can be exercised not only to enforce right conduct but right opinions. Yet few of these youths will be found in practice guilty of forming independent judgments. Few of them have received the preliminary education which enables them to form them; moreover their instructors do not venture to lay before them, in an unbiassed manner, the facts. Do these seminaries supply the students with clear ideas on the critical study of the New Testament, or on the history of dogmas and institutions? We may calculate that a youth, even of quite moderate powers, if put in possession of the facts, could draw the obvious conclusions. But the facts are distorted or concealed.

The reader may judge whether this subsidy and seminarist method of recruiting and training the clergy will serve to supply the Church of England with the type of clergyman that will be needed in the difficult times which lie ahead of us. In all probability the strong points of the new clergy will be rigid and rather intelligent unorthodoxy combined with a narrowly clericalist point of view. They will resemble the Roman priesthood in

all points save professional efficiency. There is no denying that there is at present among the authorities of the Church a tendency to favour a ministry of this sort; the ideals of the seminary have become fashionable. And the widely advertised financial difficulty will appear to many to be part of a programme devised to facilitate the realisation of these ideals. The type of man who, owing to an accident of birth, feels the financial difficulties the most, is precisely the sort of man most amenable to seminarist treatment. He has no background of general education, his mind is not trained, and he has not got ingrained in him that contempt for sacerdotal fanaticism which is characteristic of the English middle classes. A man without education or traditions can be cast in any mould you desire.

The present situation with regard to the clergy and their recruitment is more or less as follows: Those classes of the community, especially the professional classes, who have the money to train their sons for the ministry, are no longer anxious to spend it in this way. The Church, then, is driven to tap the lower middle-class and the artizan, and to provide money for the purpose. *There would be no harm whatever in this if these men were rigorously selected and given a thoroughly sound education and training.* A man of the people, if he has character, brains, and independence, if he is not a sycophant or a coward, if he will stand by his class, and not betray them, is the very man the Church needs. But the seminary-trained priestling will not be of this breed. To begin with, the wrong type is selected, and the training is not only defective but perverted. The bishops need not suppose that this rabble of the sacristy will bring the English democracy back to religion.

SOMEONE

(A slight endeavour to help the average man who is puzzled about Biblical Criticism.)

By the Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town, N.W.[1]

YOU say that you are not a Biblical scholar; indeed, that you are not much of a scholar at all. You are a professional man, of average education. But you are aware from varied and desultory reading that there has been a large change, what might almost be called a revolution, in educated views of the Bible. The compact One Volume from cover to cover, faultless and untouchable, is gone. The Book is now found to be a gradual religious literature of many kinds, ages, and values: of primaeval charm in its earlier stages, passing through its middle prophetic growth up to a climax of unequalled grandeur in the New Testament. The dates of the component parts of these Scriptures, the authorship, the structure, the historicity, the grouping have for a hundred years been ransacked and reconsidered; and again and again have been stated afresh. The New Testament itself has not been exempt from this break-up and re-casting. Epistles in it sometimes have been shifted from this writer to that or from known writers to unknown; the Apocalypse stands out in mysterious novelty; the Fourth Gospel is not bare narrative, but largely is inspired meditation; the first three Gospels are of unequal merit and in parts not literally accurate—the words and deeds which the three Gospels record being sometimes modified or re-fashioned by criticism, being sometimes deleted by it altogether. Where are we? What are we to think? What are we to do?

Let us do this. Let us take a New Testament in our hand. It is a small book—priceless indeed, and immortal; but for our purpose let us keep to the naked fact—we hold in our hand a

[1] These brief notes were read on behalf of the writer at the Monthly Meeting in March, 1929, of the Purley and East Surrey Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union. They were an introduction to the main paper on 'Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels,' which was written and read by the Rev. Dr. H. G. Hatch.

small book. What is it about? It is about *Someone*. The New Testament is as unquestionably about Someone as Euclid's Elements are about lines or Gibbon's History is about Rome. Someone permeates the New Testament; breaks through, or shines out, on every page. Someone is seen to have made a prodigious, life-changing impression on the minds and hearts—first of a small circle of men and women counted by tens, then on a larger circle counted by hundreds, then on a yet larger circle counted by thousands. The influence of Someone on these people was amazing; he pierced into the very centre and secret chambers of their being, shook them there, inspired them there, and, as their own telling phrase put it, *saved* them there; they became, as one of them said, *new creatures*; they could not express their agitation and joy; they spoke and wrote about their Benefactor in burning words of devotion, in phrases of spiritual exaltation which still are matchless. Their enthusiasm for him in life, if need be in death, marked an epoch. Shrewd observers 'doubted of them whereunto this would grow.'

Do not let us as yet *name* this Someone; we should introduce all kinds of trite, though honoured, titles, often emptied of freshness and gist by familiarity, worn to shreds by convention. We should begin to deal with *words*, whereas the vital need is for us to become *aware of a Person*. Let us keep to that, realize that. That is the clue: Someone and I, spirit to spirit, in the New Testament silently *meeting*. He reveals in the written word, with a kind of awful unmistakableness, his *presence*. He is *there*, on the other side of the thin veil of Time, almost breathingly alive. I find that what he says is true: 'He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life.' The proof lies deep, indelible in my own experience.[2]

* * * * *

Millions of people now alive find as I find, adore as I adore. On a Sunday morning lately I went to the service in Westminster

[2] Robert Louis Stevenson wrote: 'I believe it would startle and move anyone, if they could make a certain effort of imagination and read it (the New Testament and in particular the Gospel according to St. Matthew) freshly like a book, not droningly and dully like a portion of the Bible.' This quotation is due to Mr. A. Floyd, Hon. Sec. of the Purley and East Surrey Branch of the M.C.U.

Abbey. The whole solemn and beautiful function—prayers, psalms, anthem, hymns, reading, preaching—was concerned with this same Someone; the stately edifice itself was reared to his honour; the people there bowed their heads at his Name; he reigns there from the Unseen and from this spot his influence pulsates to the finger-tips of our English race. I went on to the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Westminster. *Idem aliter.* Mass was ending. The people were bent in devotion. A strong, upright, smart man came in, looking like a soldier, an officer; he knelt in lowliest worship, crossed himself, and seemed to be lost in mystical Communion. It all centred round the same Someone. I might have crossed the street and have entered the large Wesleyan Central Hall; I should have heard (probably) the Rev. Dinsdale Young speaking to a large congregation about the same Someone. It is going on over the world: over the continents, islands, high seas, in cathedrals, in little bethels, under the open sky, down the mine—the pent-up hunger and agony of the souls of men break out towards this Someone and are stilled and satisfied. A man like Byron felt it, as he stepped into St. Peter's, Rome.

> Enter: its grandeur overwhelms thee not;
> And why? it is not lessen'd; but thy mind,
> Expanded by the genius of the spot,
> Has grown colossal, and can only find
> A fit abode wherein appear enshrined
> Thy hopes of immortality; and thou
> Shalt one day, if found worthy, so defined,
> See thy God face to face, as thou dost now
> His Holy of Holies, nor be blasted by His brow.

* * * * *

This hidden power of Christ has worked unbroken among men since the apostolic age. For near two thousand years there has been the long array of incessant and indomitable believers. Every real believer of that innumerable host had had for himself, alone, in 'his own solitariness' to *find Christ.* To 'find Christ' is the pregnant phrase of the old Evangelicals. They understood it.

> Come, O thou Traveller unknown,
> Whom still I hold, but cannot see,
> My company before is gone,
> And I am left alone with thee;
> With thee all night I mean to stay,
> And wrestle till the break of day.

Modernists, too, can find Christ. The greatest Modernist of our time in England was simple as a child and humble as St. Francis; yet he was mighty in thought and knowledge, strong as a giant in character, an immovable Christian. We plain, obscure Modernists, if we will, may follow at a good distance off in his track. Such Modernists can find Christ, and their peculiar task in the future will be to help their fellow-Christians amid critical difficulties to find Him.

Modernists take Biblical criticism seriously, with candour and appreciation; and they discover that in the long run it is here not to destroy, but to fulfil. Sane and tested criticism, approved in the final court of scholars, inflicts no substantial harm or loss on the historical Figure of our Lord. The Figure becomes, indeed, less detailed and ornate; but now it almost startles you with its actuality, it is *felt* like the known presence of some unseen person in a room, it has shed a certain artificiality but it has gained a wonderful verisimilitude and a first-hand convincingness. Time has changed the vesture of the Figure, but not the reality.

Thus for Modernism the Bible is born again and is starting on a new, illimitable life. Reverent Modernists can say with Bunyan: 'And now I began to look into the Bible with new eyes, and read as I never read before, still crying out to God that I might know the Truth, and way to heaven and glory.' Reverent Modernists can even, in spirit if not in letter, repeat the beautiful confession of St. Basil: 'Every deed and every word of our Saviour Jesus Christ is a canon of piety and virtue . . . . Enter into the depth of His contemplations, become a communicant in truths mystically delivered to thee.'

CHURCHYARDS AND MODERN MEMORIALS

By Arthur H. Collins, M.A.

THE churchyards of our countryside should be as pleasing as possible to the eye, and at the same time instructive to the mind. For the eye seeks a harmonious setting for our ancient parish churches, while the mind needs help to remember that 'the righteous hath hope in his death.' Can we say that this ideal is being practically realized to-day?

It is certain that many of our churchyards have kept much of their former beauty and peacefulness, though usually they are suffering through the erection of unsuitable memorials. Who is responsible for this?

Some will blame the clergy: as custodians of these places they are empowered to refuse permission for unsatisfactory memorials. But refusal is most difficult. The vicar may fear that all is not well with the design which must be submitted to him. He may dislike the lettering of the inscription, or feel that the material chosen for the memorial is wrong. But if he takes strong action, he knows that there will be no force of public opinion behind him. His zeal or knowledge will pass for mere caprice, and his unwillingness be answered by the view that such things are universally allowed. Perhaps with a sigh of disappointment the vicar will do no more than see whether the inscription is suitable, guarding at the same time against the admission of doggerel verses. In what respects do our modern memorials—particularly those put up by persons of moderate means—need improvement?

Answers to this question are best grouped, as we believe, under three headings—those of Material, Design, and Lettering. After we have dealt with the weak points, we may then go further and suggest some remedies.

Materials for Headstones.

The old use of local stone has, alas, nearly ceased. Simultaneously, the excellent work of monumental masons has de-

clined. It is seldom that memorials are designed or executed by skilled men acquainted with local conditions; for marble monuments are usually imported from Carrara ready-made. All that is left for the local mason to do is to letter and set up a design already provided for him.

But is not Carrara marble the most beautiful material for memorials, far better than local stone? A recent report issued by the British Institute of Industrial Art strongly urges that it is not. 'Marble is not well suited to harmonize with the subdued tones of the English sky and natural surroundings.'

The above report has been criticised by an obviously interested party, whose judgment is given that 'Marble is the only material that will give the soft tones, the subtle lights and shades so loved of the artist.' The latter view may be generally true apart from our churchyards, but these are surely places where to thoughtful and noticing people its extended use will appear altogether wrong. This adverse judgment is based on no jealousy of marble, nor yet on a desire to foster the use of British stone for its own sake. Our mediaeval churches, after all, owe a great deal to stone imported from the great quarries at Caen. There is no doubt about the beauty of marble in itself, or about its excellence for the highest forms of sculpture. But its use in our churchyards occasions excessive contrast and glare, which are the very opposite of restfulness.

It has been urged that the British Institute of Industrial Art has attacked unfairly the use of marble. This is not so. Its recent publication, 'The Art of Graveyard Monuments,' gives reasons in a judicial manner why the use of local stone is better. Where an individual who feels strongly on the subject might urge the total prohibition of marble, this report in effect pleads that other materials should have a fair chance, instead of being allowed no place in some of our cemeteries.

Design.

With the increasing use of marble, there has taken place a great deterioration in design. We may not admire in all respects the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but we must admit that the memorials of this period are notable for the choice of

suitable materials, and of excellent outline designs. It is urged that present designs are such as have satisfied popular predilection. But the taste of the public is not safely followed unless it is educated. At the same time there is among masons and the public a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with things as they are. The usual design for a churchyard memorial is nowadays a Calvary Cross with three steps. Now no imitation of the actual Cross of Christ is beautiful in itself. If art is to be concerned with our churchyards, we should do well to follow the example of our forefathers and exclude altogether from them close imitations of the Cross of suffering. The great Bishop Westcott has taught us that Christian art is the interpretation of beauty in life, under the light of the Incarnation. But the Calvary Cross suggests rather the ugliness of death.

Realistic representations of the central event of Good Friday no doubt have their value, but, where chiefly used, they obscure the essential fact that Christ is risen and ascended into triumph. Where a memorial cross, therefore, is erected, it should by its more ornamental shape suggest victory over death rather than death itself.

Another argument against the use of the Calvary Cross is that it is essentially a wood form, and very wasteful in stone. For half of the material must be wasted. Particularly unseemly is the multiplication of crucifixes as private memorials. One crucifix, or tall upstanding cross might well be placed in a burial ground, to stand high above all the graves therein as a monument for all. But here as before realism is out of place: for the Figure of our Lord should not be represented in the moment of death.

Some of the most simple and reverent memorials are the small, ornamental crosses, where the cross is incised or cut in relief on a round head. They date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and seldom project more than eighteen inches from the ground. Being very thick through, they are most permanent, whilst their size makes them unostentatious.

Such crosses might well form a model for use to-day. But they would not hold anything but a short inscription. Recumbent cross slabs could often advantageously be used.

Lettering.

As to lettering, we should now be learning better things, for our war graves have set us an admirable example. The excellence of these little monuments is evident in several other ways; for their size, their shape, their materials, and the filling up of the space above the inscription can teach us much to-day.

But it is still too often forgotten that lettering is an art, with a long history. It is not enough that an inscription should be tolerably neat and legible. Probably the best capital lettering in the world is to be found on ancient Roman monuments, such as Trajan's column. In this example, the letters have a positive beauty of form and a variety of width and spacing, while at the same time they are most legible. But to-day, lettering in our churchyard inscriptions is mostly of a monotonous width and spacing; all strokes are of similar thickness; and it seems to be forgotten that the internal shape of a letter, *i.e.* the space it encloses, is as important as the external shape. The fashion for leaded inscriptions is responsible for much inferior lettering. For the letters have to be made too wide in the strokes, in order that the lead may stay in. If it be urged that this filling is used for the sake of legibility, it is well to remember that good lettering without lead becomes easier to read as time goes on. But designers and masons must have reasonable freedom in the choice of lettering. Italics are very often quite as suitable as Roman letters, or the two may well be combined. Nor should black letter be ruled out altogether. In a monument of Gothic type it would be very suitable, while it has the additional advantage that it can be carved on a coarser stone than Roman characters. The main strokes are wider, and the whole inscription would be most durable.

Mr. Johnston's book, *Writing, Illuminating, and Lettering*, in Pitman's Artistic Crafts series, is very full of information and guidance. Excellent reasons are given by the author as to why letters should vary in width. In fact, so cogent are the reasons, that a reader may wonder why he has not thought of it all before. Letters such as O Q C G and D should approach the circle in width, and may be beautiful when thus executed. Letters which are vertically doubled (B E F R S Y and X)

should be somewhat narrow, while others such as M and W, which are doubled horizontally, should be correspondingly wide. A wide E is ugly, because each of its parts would enclose more than a square; while a narrow M would have no beauty, for its angles would appear insignificant in their narrowness.

The exceptions to these rules are almost as instructive as the rules themselves. For example, H should be tolerably wide, though a 'two-storey' letter, as otherwise its uprights would be heavy; and A should not be too narrow, for the top portion of the letter would lack proper emphasis. What has been said applies primarily to Roman lettering, but has its value in the use of italics too.

Methods of Improvement in Memorials.

It was a recommendation of the British Institute of Industrial Art, in the report which we have mentioned above, that a portfolio of drawings and photographs of suitable and simple forms of churchyard monuments should be published, accompanied by full-sized examples of good lettering. Owing to lack of funds this project had to be realized only in part. The designs were in fact published in twelve numbers of the *Stone Trades Journal*, and copies of the whole may be obtained at six shillings from the Institute. It is a pity that they could not see their way to give some worthy examples of lettering. But this omission is to be regretted the less, for nearly every old churchyard contains good examples from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; while equally instructive specimens both of capitals and italics may be studied in the mural monuments of the same period. And now for the proposed designs themselves. Whilst we cannot express unqualified admiration for everyone issued in the set, we feel sure that the general use of designs such as these would lead to a great advance in the art of graveyard monuments.

Particularly instructive are the ornaments which fill the heads of the stones as designed. In this respect the old Georgian headstones are of not much use to us. No one to-day wishes to go back to the skulls and crossbones, spades, coffins and hour-glasses so fashionable then. Even the cherubs of the period,

often represented with taste and beauty, are likely to find little appreciation under the conditions of the present day. The Institute might well have used its weighty authority to discourage the placing of curbs around graves. Such curbs are never beautiful, nor do they give any real scope to the designer. In our opinion, several of the Institute designs which are planned for curbs would be executed far better without them. A small stone at the foot is a better method of delimiting a grave. It would be a good thing if every monumental mason were to have a copy of these designs, which may be used without any fee. Usually quite simple, they are suitable for people of moderate means.

It would also help the clergy to know about them. For they could show the designs to their parishioners, and discuss their use as opportunity offered at Church Councils and Conferences. We are sure that the talented authors of the Institute designs do not merely wish that they should be copied, but rather that they should also be suggestive of the lines on which improvement might be sought.

It cannot be urged too strongly that the use of local stone should, wherever possible, be encouraged. For local stone blends more successfully than any marble with our country churches, being at the same time in better harmony with the neighbouring landscape. The weathering of the stone is often one of its best features. Cleaning is not necessary as it is with marble. In Kent there is little stone fitted for monumental purposes, but the local masons have in the past made great and successful use of Portland stone. This tones in excellently with the courses of flint commonly found in the church walls.

This Portland stone, however, has been found unsuitable for a Cotswold churchyard, where (as we hear on good authority) Clipsham stone may be used with advantage. In Cornwall the local granite has, owing to its hardness, to be ornamented with special care. Builders of the fine churches there discovered this long ago. But granite and slate seldom look really well away from the districts in which they are found. The taste of our older craftsmen may safely be followed here.

We cannot suggest anything better to our designers than to take some hints from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The headstones of this period vary according to district, affording a number of suggestive outlines. In spite of this variety, there is a family likeness. It is curious that in central England such monuments have a strong overhanging coping, which seems to be unknown in Kent. Such varieties, designed by masons in the neighbourhood, would add remarkably to the interest of our churchyards.

It is a pity that memorials throughout the whole of England should be governed by designers in Italy or London, who have no sympathy with the *genius loci*. More use might be made of designs like the mediaeval wheel-crosses. These seem to require short inscriptions, as the Georgian type require long.

We mentioned above some of the excellent fillings of the heads of monuments in the British Institute designs. Before the writer had seen them, he had been rather at a loss to discover what should take the place of older ornaments not fitting now. On one design is an ornamental or strongly overhanging coping; on another some well-managed foliage; on yet another a wreath with ribbons. A chalice or a chalice and paten will be a suitable adornment for the grave of a clergyman. A sacred monogram or a small incised or raised cross will be of general fitness.

The profession of the person commemorated might well be shown by some implement or symbol, or by a simple representation of some scene in his daily work. It is a pity that examples of heraldry are so rare to-day in this connection.

Where a cross is used as an ornament, it is well to follow the ancient custom of slightly elaborating it. For the elaboration seems to point onwards from the sufferings of our Lord to the glorious victory that followed. Monuments should be much smaller than they are. Those that stand at the head of war graves are of an excellent size. It would be a good thing if anything pretentiously large were forbidden.

Briefly to conclude. The more publicity the subject of the improvement of our monuments has, the greater the hope for the future. It is surely quite as suitable as any other for discussion at the Diocesan and Ruridecanal Conferences of the Church. The Diocesan Advisory Committees which do excellent work in the protection of the fabrics of our churches, might do equally well in our churchyards. Someone in authority should

speak strongly against the horrid custom of filling the grave space with marble chippings, in order to save the trouble of proper care. A lantern lecture with slides of approved designs would promote interest. This might well be included in the schedules of lectures of the new Community Council movement. For the importance of the matter has passed beyond purely ecclesiastical limits.

With the discouragement of ready-made catalogue designs, there should be an increasing encouragement of our craftsmen to show what they can do. The more the art is encouraged, the more will it be found a profession and a livelihood for people with taste. Perhaps, most of all, the general public should bestir itself to get out of a rut. We should not be content with something everyone else has had.

If an improvement does not speedily take place, we shudder to think what will be the appearance of our churchyards in a few years' time. What is still beautiful and seemly must be kept beautiful and seemly. As people acquire more knowledge, they will be better able to admire what is good. It is far from our aim to add to the expenses of memorials, or to take away a fair profit from their makers. What is simplest is often best; and simplicity need not be expensive.

The writer has up to this point concerned himself solely with churchyard memorials, but improvement in their surroundings is unfortunately quite as necessary. The country churchyard is notoriously difficult and expensive to keep in decency. If it is scythed by a labourer, his work is made much harder by the mounds of earth which are customary on the tops of the graves. Such mounds are still in demand over modern graves, whether in obedience to long custom or to mark the spot where a body is laid; they are, however, useless when a memorial has been put in its place. People who wish these heaps of earth to remain should at least maintain them in a seemly condition. It is surely reasonable for an incumbent and his parochial church council to require that they should be mended or ended. A surface completely flattened might even be run over with a lawn mower, if one be used for the edges of the churchyard paths. We think that there can be no objection whatever to flattening unnamed and unknown graves, provided there is no risk of the spaces

being used again for future burials. It is perhaps this fear of future burials which more than anything else is responsible for these mounds.

With decreased use of marble, we hope that the ugly habit of filling the grave spaces with marble chippings will disappear altogether. If the relatives or friends of the departed have no better way of covering the surface, it is far better mown or scythed. We can hardly trust ourselves to speak of the trouble-saving (and therefore in this connection unworthy) habit of placing artificial flowers under a glass dome on the top of a grave. The humble jampot, and the more pretentious vase of tin to hold living flowers are better, but they too are usually unworthy and lacking in fitness.

Some of us may be fortunate enough to associate the memory of some beautiful churchyard with the thought of a row of well-kept standard roses on each side of the long path, or it may be of judiciously planted bulbs flourishing in their season.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHURCH CONGRESS REPORT*

By common consent the Cheltenham Church Congress was the most successful for many years. A protest against the inclusion of the Bishop of Birmingham and Dr. Major among the speakers added to popular interest. The protest lacked both wide and influential support and drew a severe rebuke from the President of the Congress. Its promoters, a body of Anglo-Romans, may also have felt a grievance that no one of themselves was given an opportunity to express to the Congress their contempt for 'Anglicanism,' but they can rest assured that we are very familiar with it.

The Congress was largely conceived, very carefully arranged, and admirably carried out. The subject 'Anglicanism, Past, Present and Future,' was too large for the treatment of all its divisions and sub-divisions to be of equal value, and in fact the contributions vary even more in importance than in length; but the Report makes a book of some 500 pages, not to be neglected by anyone who wishes to know the mission, character and condition of the Church of England. The Congress was also a great and deserved personal triumph for the Bishop of Gloucester, who presided.

It is impossible to deal *seriatim* with the papers. The main subjects are The National Church, The English Reformation and Movements in the Church of England (each of these is sub-divided, and together, with some inexactness, they cover the 'Past' section of the general subject), The Anglican Interpretation of the Christian Faith, The Faith and Modern Thought (this last has 8 sub-divisions); Relations with Other Com-

* *The Anglican Communion*, being the Report of the Church Congress at Cheltenham, 1928. Edited by Canon H. A. Wilson. (London: John Murray. Price 7/6 net.)

munions and Reunion in the Mission Field is presumably the justification of 'Future' in the Congress subject. The four Congress sermons, by the Bishops of Durham and Chelmsford (now of Manchester), Bishop Gore, and the Archbishop of Dublin, are also printed.

Dr. Headlam's Presidential Address is a remarkable allocution, both wise and terse, and covers, in anticipatory outline, the course of the Congress. He discusses (1) The relations of Church and State, (2) The corporate authority of the Church and religious parties, (3) The faith of Christ and modern thought, (4) Reunion. A brief review of the past introduces his Lordship's views on Prayer Book Rejection. He thinks the repeal of the Act of Uniformity would 'do all that is necessary at the present moment to restore the spiritual independence of the Church of England.' He hopes for no early satisfactory solution, but believes that the alternatives are Disestablishment (which he does not want) or similar treatment to that accorded the Church of Scotland.

There follows a vigorous protest against the growth of party spirit, particularly of the type which exalts partisan tenets into principles and denounces 'the Catholic voice of the Church' as compromise. We protest against the inclusion of those called 'Modernists' in this condemnation. This, indeed, is admirably refuted by Canon Streeter's paper, than which *apologia* Modernists could desire no better. The fallacy can further be demonstrated to any reader who will take the trouble to compare Dr. Major's paper (which must have disappointed any who had been led to expect 'fireworks') with Dr. Headlam's own address. One might be forgiven for a first thought that the two had not been prepared independently, so close is the similarity. Further, the Bishop attributes this growth of party spirit to party-training of ordinands in institutions 'which deliberately and purposely lay themselves out to turn out good Anglo-Catholics, or good Evangelicals, or good Modernists, rather than good members of the Church of England.' He writes:

> 'At Oxford, for example, there are now three theological colleges, each of a definite theological complexion - - - - all designed to produce good party men—while the work of the Church of England and the sober teaching of Christianity is neglected.'

Now this charge is, at least in the College with which the writer has been associated for the past six years, definitely false, and Dr. Headlam's imputation is the less excusable since he was, as Regius Professor of Divinity, in close touch with the teaching of Theology at Oxford, and did much to improve it. The facts are these.

In the first place many men are far less 'party-men' when they leave Ripon Hall than when they first join it, and I have no reason to doubt that the same is true of St. Stephen's House and Wycliffe Hall. The truth is that with not a few of the men who come to Ripon Hall, the difficulty is, not to make them into 'good Modernists' (in Dr. Headlam's sense) but to bring their opinions within any limits which the Bishop would recognise as definitely Christian at all. But for this 'party institution' these men would never seek Holy Orders.

Secondly, in many instances, the work has to be done in the shortest possible time. At the end of this period a Candidate has to pass an 'examination' which includes two papers on the Old Testament and two on the New, two papers on Christian Doctrine and two which are supposed to cover the whole of Church History in outline, a paper on Christian Morals and one on Christian Worship. This field has often to be covered

in a year, or a little longer, by a man with no previous knowledge of theology. The work of 'teaching' resolves itself into a continual 'cramming' on a level hardly higher and often below that of a Secondary School, which disgusts those who have so to 'teach.' What *chance* is there of making party-men? Elsewhere Dr. Headlam tells us the things on which 'the Church should dwell if it wishes its message to be heard. They are the fundamental teaching concerning God and Jesus Christ; the revelation of God as righteousness and love and sacrifice; the salvation of man in Christ; a message telling us of the life and destiny of man. It is the presentation to us of reality.' All of which is very true; but how *can* men be trained to do this intelligently and effectively (under the conditions which, as Dr. Headlam well knows, apply to theological college teaching, even in Oxford), when they lack even the rudiments of philosophy and psychology? Even so, the ordinand is often less a narrow party man than the clergyman 'of parochial experience' to whom he goes as curate. When at Oxford, Dr. Headlam did something to improve matters by forming what is known as the Oxford Ordination Course; but it is now almost dead. I entirely agree with him on the evils of party spirit, and I believe that it will, unless checked, mean the disappearance of that 'sobriety of Anglicanism' of which the Bishop speaks; but he is wrong in assigning most of the blame to party theological colleges (which I wish did not exist), and in so far as they are blameworthy in the teaching they give the remedy is wholly in the hands of the Bishops: the theological colleges' teaching is controlled by episcopal examinational requirements for Ordination.

I apologise for this digression, but Dr. Headlam speaks as one having authority. His remarks on the relation of the Gospel to modern thought are careful and balanced. What he says about its relation to scientific thought is sound, and the papers which deal with this are among the best contributions to the Congress Report. He falls into a much too easy generalisation about Holy Scripture and the difficulties attendant on the modern study of it. It is, *e.g.* untrue that 'all modern investigation tends to show that they (the Synoptic Gospels) are good history.' Again, we in the main agree with Dr. Headlam's personal estimate of them; but Dr. Rawlinson's paper reveals the looseness of the Bishop's comforting generalization. The problems concerning the Bible are in some ways the most serious of modern problems and they are not faced by these Congress papers. In a field so vast as the Congress subject it may seem ungenerous to complain of omissions; but the single paper by Archdeacon Rawlinson, excellent though it is, on the authority of the Bible, scarcely represents an adequate facing by the Congress of this particular and, for the Church of England, so serious modern problem. But, as we have said, this Report is full of excellent things; we wish it the widest circulation. If it could be read and pondered by all thoughtful members of our Church it would not only make the actual success of the Cheltenham Congress permanent, but might create a new vision of the character and mission of the Church of England.

J. S. Bezzant.

CROCKFORD*

The Editor of this valuable work remarks that its non-appearance in 1928 helped to make that year memorable in the history of the Church of England. Our own observation being less encyclopaedic, we confess we had failed to notice anything that could justify this claim. But humour

**Crockford's Clerical Directory*, 1929 (Fifty-Eighth Issue). (Oxford University Press. Price 42/-.)

needs no apology; and it is certain that all concerned in any way with the organization of the Church of England would find their work tremendously hampered if no *Crockford* appeared for two or three years. In this, the fifty-eighth issue, the familar form has been to some extent changed. To the ordinary user the most noticeable alteration is that in the type, which is smaller. A new division of its general information into nine sections enhances the already exceptionally high standard of *Crockford* as a book of reference. We have before noted that one often useful piece of information about the clergy which *Crockford* does not give is whether or not they are married.

As usual, the Preface is occasionally sarcastic and amusing; its language has a Biblical flavour; its comments on current affairs, while necessarily too brief to be of decisive value, are excellently provocative. Among other things it notes that in spite of, or partly because of, the beneficent efforts of the Church Assembly, 'the average benefice is worth to-day about 16 per cent. less than before the war.' Leaving out of account the effects of the Tithe Act, the Dilapidations Measure, and the Pensions Measure 'the clergy as a whole are worse off than they were fifteen years ago.' The Tithe Act, if its provisions really work 'will be a very real benefit to the clergy, and will afford some consolation for the fact that about half of them can no longer be said to own the temporalities of their benefices in any real sense, but are entirely dependent financially upon a single corporation, over which they have no control whatever.' The demands upon Assembly Funds exceed its receipts, despite the fact that it is probably true to say 'that congregations as a whole are giving, for one purpose or another, quite twice as much per head as was usual fifteen years ago'; but the expenses of parochial needs have more than doubled. As for the supply of clergy 'if it be true to say that "the tide has turned," we are not yet within sight of meeting our annual losses,' not to mention the deficiencies of the years which the locust hath eaten. In his remarks on the position caused by the rejection of the Prayer Book the Editor has two brief observations which really go to the heart of the difficulty. He would accept the principle that the Church, when its mind has been fully ascertained, must in the last resort retain its right to formulate its faith and regulate its expression in forms of worship, but notes, what so many acute minds appear to overlook, namely, 'that it may not be altogether easy in practice to determine when the mind of the Church has been fully ascertained' and 'most dioceses appear to include a group of irreconcilable congregationalists among the clergy.' Whoso is wise will ponder these things. J.S.B.

CHRISTIAN UNITY*

The Archbishop of York, in an introduction contributed to this volume, observes that no previous surveys can compare with it in thoroughness and completeness. It is indeed a work of extraordinary industry, concerning itself not only with recent attempts at reunion and the modern policies which lie behind them, but with all the negotiations and attempts set on foot since the Reformation. Much of this information will be new to the general reader, and, even from an historical point of view, it was well worth collecting and publishing.

There is an admirable summary of the pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 which, the author remarks, 'stands out as the most

**Christian Unity: its History and Challenge.* By the Rev. Gaius Jackson Slosser. (Kegan Paul. 21/-.)

significant gathering of its kind in the modern era.' Of the replies on the part of Free Churchmen to these pronouncements, he observes that 'all expressed profound appreciation of the spirit shown, and the hope that a way might be found to reach union. The exact status of their ministers is what concerned them most.' This indeed was the rock upon which the vessel split; for in the final reply made by the Federal Council of the Free Churches (September, 1925), it was pointed out that 'the insistence that Free Church ministers must accept ordination—at least, in the form known as *sub conditione*—at Episcopal hands had no prospect of being accepted by any non-episcopal Church.' They observed that 'the question of authorization must be answered by some other means than ordination,' and that is where the matter now stands. Whether it will be left to stand there depends on events in 1930.

Dr. Slosser throughout his historical chapters preserves an objective attitude, and writes with the most studious restraint. His last chapter, however, 'Helps and Hindrances to Progress,' is of the nature of comment upon the present situation, and expresses his hopes and fears for the future. There is first of all an able summary of the reasons which compel many people to agitate for reunion, and the one which at present will, we think, have the strongest appeal is the sixth: 'To place corporate Christianity in a position where it can speak with moral authority, and by power of example, when it exhorts the races, states, and nations of the world to cease from all war, to unite for peace, and to live in love and unity together.'

Our author observes that 'the tendency among Evangelicals is more and more to keep the denomination, creed, or confession in the background. When Church unions are formed, especially in the Mission Fields, brevity and simplicity are sought for in making credal statements.' He notes also that 'it is to history and to science, and not to dogmatism, that we are to go for facts.' Furthermore, 'there can be no approach towards unity which is permanent except it be a comprehensive and inclusive unity which, though it has a very simple basis, tolerates the various interpretations of the historical Jesus, the insistence being merely upon *being like Him* and on *bearing Christlike fruit.*' These are remarks of the utmost importance, and indicate that the reunion for which Dr. Slosser stands is not a confederation of fundamentalists with their backs to the wall.

Dr. Slosser is alive to the different religious demands of different temperaments, and he would allow for various types of individual. Reunion must involve 'the widest tolerance of viewpoints or interpretations.' And he quotes with approval the words of Bishop Creighton that, 'the restoration of the unity of Christendom will be not by affirming any one of the existing systems as universal, but by a federation.'

This is altogether a timely book; and its moderation of tone, together with its comprehensive outlook, besides its quiet optimism, make of it an achievement of the very first importance. All those who labour for Christian reunion, a cause in which the great denominational leaders, were they now living, would co-operate, owe a heavy debt of gratitude to Dr. Slosser.

J.C.H.

MOSES.*

Shepherd of Israel is the story of Moses, seen through an atmosphere of sentiment. It never sinks to the mushy abyss of the film version of *Ben Hur*, but it is a long way from the more successful pictures like *Aphrodite*

**Shepherd of Israel.* By Leonora Eyles. (1929, London: Constable & Co., 7/6.)

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

or even Mrs. Mitchison's stories of Greece and Rome. The strength of *Shepherd of Israel* is its picturesque detail, the weakness is the treatment of the principal figure. Had the character of Moses been left to reveal itself in action and reaction, the author's skill in handling incident and scene would probably have produced a more convincing book and left something to the reader. It would not have mattered whether she followed the Old Testament narrative literally or not. As it is she has applied the assistance of supplementary imagination mainly to the inner workings of the mind of Moses, and has made him a pioneer of a religion of Humanity in a world of ignorance and superstition. At the Burning Bush Moses sees his own face reflected in a mirror of sun-frayed mist and is confirmed in the call of his inner self to work for the humanizing of his degraded brethren. Moses in fact is the character Mrs. Eyles has shown us before, the friend of Mankind, haunted by the ugliness in life and misunderstood by those he would help. The motif of his life is a quest for a religion of Humanity:

> Here I learnt that God dwells in Man imprisoned. Here I must find ways for His release—here I must find out what He will be when He is released and what He will do with Man.

He draws up the Commandments, but only the Second Table:

> . . . . he tried to find what was Man's duty to God . . . . it seemed to him that in setting out straitly man's duty to Man he had covered the other duty.

When facts force him to admit that people are still too ignorant to appreciate the divinity of Man, he adds the first three Commandments, hoping that they will in time lead men to the God within.

Shepherd of Israel is a well-written and well-constructed novel, but its spirit is wholly modern and almost wholly North-European. The abstractions and logic of the thought of this Moses are alien to the Hebrew mind.

E. J. MARTIN.

MECHANISM AND TELEOLOGY.

This book is an able, learned and cautious attempt to grapple with, or to appraise, that whole body of recent literature on those border-line questions involving philosophy, science and theology which constitutes one of the most notable characteristics of modern British thought. The questions at stake here involve, further, some of the central problems for religious thought in our day. The book is more of the nature of a closely-knit discussion and elucidation than a thesis. Dr. Fulton, it is clear, is seeking after a synoptic view which will be faithful to the legitimate requirements of science, philosophy, and theology; and the result, even if it may not be regarded as one of those massive, finally-satisfying structures whose advent mark an epoch, represents, at least, another stone in the apologetic edifice which we sometimes see in our dreams.

The title of the book is *Nature and God,* with the explanatory subtitle, *An introduction to theistic studies with special reference to the relations of science and religion.* Several other titles might have been chosen to indicate the scope of the book—e.g., *Nature and Purpose,* which seems to have partly commended itself to the author, or, perhaps better, *Mechanism and Theology,* which suggests the central problem confronted by the book.

**Nature and God.* By William Fulton, D.D., B.Sc. The Alexander Robertson Lectures for 1926. (T. & T. Clark. 1927. 9/-.)

Professor Fulton, now of Glasgow University, is in the best sense 'Modernist.' Is it possible, one may well ask, for anyone of scientific as well as of religious mind, acquainted with the unhappy controversy between science and theology, to be anything else? The modern theologian tends to leave ultimate problems of cosmology to metaphysical philosophy, so he leaves it to natural science to expound the cosmogenic process. He does not oppose the Creation story in Genesis to the cosmogonies of modern science. 'It is with the theological cosmogonies of ancient religion generally, and of Babylonian religion in particular, that the first chapter of Genesis is properly to be compared.' 'The theologian must learn that as first things come first, he should throw the emphasis of His (I presume that Dr. Fulton does not mean His here, as printed in the book) witness to God on the ethico-religious experience, while remaining openly receptive to the scientific knowledge of his age, and at the same time abandoning the foolishness and the faithlessness of defending discredited causes.'—So much for the author's mental orientation and general standpoint.

The book is divided into two parts. The first deals with *Natural Theology and Natural Science.* Here the author gives a summary historical account of the place of natural theology in theistic thought, recognising the significance of the critical contribution of Kant. This leads to an exposition of the function of natural science, in which the author expounds with sympathy the 'descriptive' view, involving as it does the necessary limitation of scientific standpoint. It is in the light of this position that I understand a phrase used—'a practical delimitation of frontiers as between science and religion.' For it is one thing to maintain, in the interests of essential metaphysics, the limitation of scientific *function,* it is quite another to maintain the limitation of scientific scope or subject-matter. The author has too true a knowledge of science to erect the old 'No Thoroughfare' notices over realms regarded as sacrosanct to theology. 'Delimitation of frontiers' can only be defended, as it seems to me, if it means that metaphysical interpretation will never be rendered unnecessary by whatever future successes (to which we may very confidently, and with 'faith,' look forward) the scientific method achieves. 'Cosmography cannot be raised to a cosmology.' 'Empirical description, however generalised, and religious or philosophical interpretation are two different languages.'

The second part of the book deals with *The Concept of Purpose and the Order of Nature.* Here some very acute and living problems arise. One of the chief, doubtless, is that raised by biological research. Modernist Christians will, I imagine, have pondered the question asked by J. Needham in *Science, Religion and Reality,* whether, namely, it were wise 'to nail the colours of religion to the precarious mast of neo-vitalism.' The author, it would seem, has not overlooked such a question. In spite of his sympathy for the views of J. Arthur Thomson, Haldane and others, he recognises that the thoroughgoing mechanistic hypothesis in biology 'may not be ruled out of court.' This recognition, however, seems at times to be hesitant. Thus he says: 'the mechanistic view in biology, as in physics, is not necessarily irreconcilable with the belief in divine Mind and Purpose.' Would not a less-hesitating insight have put the matter positively, and declared that divine Mind and Purpose are essential to the understanding of mechanism, whether in biology or in physics? A more confident, and yet still cautious, utterance appears later in the book: 'a spiritual or theistic outlook upon nature appears to be

consonant either with a mechanistic or with a teleological, that is, dynamistic or vitalistic biology.' In this whole connection the profound, the far-reaching, words of Lotze in the Introduction of his *Microcosmus* occur to the mind—they are quoted by Needham and also by Dr. Fulton—'how absolutely universal is the extent and at the same time how completely subordinate the significance of the mission which mechanism has to fulfil in the structure of the world.'

Certain living problems which inevitably arise from such a discussion —*e.g.*, Miracle and Prayer—are not, to the regret no doubt of many readers, dealt with by the author.

In the meantime, we rejoice to note the distinction drawn in the following sentence: 'It is one thing to repudiate in the name of science the doctrine of special provisions and adaptations, and, in general, all theologising in science, but quite another thing to be willing to ignore or discount in the name of science the vast impression of immanent reason and purpose which the totality of the system of nature, animate and inanimate, makes upon the mind and spirit.' The repudiation referred to in the former part of the sentence involves, as it seems to us, the surrender of the thinly-disguised deism of much traditional theology. The 'immanent reason and purpose' recognised in the totality of things leads to the God in Whom we live and move and have our being. 'The true image of God,' as the author concludes a discussion which, if not final, is both timely and weighty, 'is not the pre-existent Creator of the deistic theology, nor the static timeless Absolute of pantheism, but the eternal Redeemer of the religious consciousness.' C. J. WRIGHT.

A USEFUL BOOK.*

More than a dozen years ago an earlier work by Mr. Lushington was reviewed in this journal, and his new work is very welcome. In a foreword, the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard commends it to 'seekers after a reasonable and compelling faith,' and in his closing words the author makes his appeal to 'all who have visions of a larger good and who dream dreams of holier brotherhood.' So it is not surprising to find throughout the book a large and liberal appeal, and the effort to use the fuller light of our day to 'lead the young to see the summits which were hidden before.' Mr. Lushington's work may well prove a mine of beautiful and inspiring things for those who wish to help the younger generation. H.G.T.

**Christ's Way and Modern Problems.* By F. de W. Lushington, M.A., Hon. C.F. (Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co. 3/6.)

CYPRIAN.*

Hitherto no separate edition of this treatise of Cyprian's has been available, and this handy little volume, with its Latin text and English translation upon opposite pages, should prove of great use to the scholar, and even to the general reader who cares to explore the mentality of a past age. It is in this book that Cyprian gives classical expression to the hierarchical conception of the Church. Obedience to that Church, and to the Bishop as its representative, is an unfailing principle with him. If the clear and crude expression of a position be the first means of making us doubt its tenability, Cyprian to-day, all unconsiously, may be regarded as a sort of Protestant propagandist. But be that as it may, this is an admirable and scholarly piece of work of Mr. Blakeney's.

**Cyprian. De Unitate Ecclesiae.* The Latin text translated, with an Introduction and brief Notes. By E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 2/6.)